

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE newspapers, a few weeks ago, contained the report of the discovery in Rome of the bodies of S. Paul and S. Peter. The reports were evidently inaccurate in some details and might be wholly unreliable, so that little attention was given to them by scholars.

But Professor SAYCE has been in Rome and has verified the facts on the spot. He writes :

‘Among the excavations I saw at Rome the most interesting to me were those underneath the Church of S. Sebastiano. According to tradition, the bodies of SS. Paul and Peter were secreted here at the bottom of a well during the Valerian persecution (A.D. 258), and it was from here that Constantine removed them to his new Basilica on the Vatican. When the modern S. Peter’s was built, the sarcophagi were opened in the presence of the Pope, and an eye-witness has left a statement that the bodies were still lying in them intact, with the gold cross placed over them by Constantine, then the sarcophagi were closed again and deposited in the “Confessio” under S. Peter’s.’

Now, says Professor SAYCE, ‘the excavations have brought to light a basilica of the age of Constantine under the modern Church of S. Sebastiano, and under that again the remains of a Roman private house. From the “tricia” or dining-room of this there is a descent into a long

corridor, where two or three large Christian stone sarcophagi were lying. Beyond these the corridor extended to a niche-like chamber by the side of the bottom of a well. The walls of the corridor are covered with the graffiti of Christian visitors from the middle of the third century onwards, commemorating their visits to the bodies of the two Apostles and invoking their prayers. In many cases it is stated that before descending into the catacomb the pilgrims had partaken of a “refrigeratio” (refreshment) in the tricia above, which is explained as the Agapê, thus showing that the Agapê was still observed in Rome at the end of the third century.’

Professor SAYCE concludes : ‘Once more archaeology has confirmed tradition, and the bodies of the Apostles are actually lying under S. Peter’s.’

It was necessary that some one should give himself to a detailed examination of Modernism. For the issues are fundamental, and newspaper correspondence is unsatisfactory. And now it turns out that the man who has done it, or done it first, is the Rev. Charles HARRIS, D.D., formerly Lecturer in Theology in St. David’s College, Lampeter, and now Rector of Colwall.

Dr. HARRIS is a scholar. His books are *Pro*

Fide, a successful apologetic for an open-minded, orthodox Christianity, and *The Creeds and Modern Thought*, a defence of creed making and of the Apostles' Creed. He is a scholar, and he deliberately undertakes to meet modernist scholars with scholarship. 'The "Modernists,"' he says, 'can lay claim to some good scholars and thinkers; but they have no monopoly of sound philosophy or of accurate scholarship. The only effective method is to criticize the critics, to meet learning with learning and scholarship with scholarship. That is what this book endeavours to do.' The title of the volume is *Creeds or no Creeds?* (Murray; 15s. net).

Dr. HARRIS covers the whole ground. The ground is partly philosophical. 'By general consent, the main philosophic basis of Modernism is the Kantian doctrine of "Immanence," or (to use the more intelligible term) the Relativity of Human Knowledge; nor do I think it possible to resist the contention of Professor Gardner, and indeed of most philosophic Modernists, that, given Kantianism, Modernism necessarily follows. Accordingly, the main object of this book is to refute the doctrine of Immanence, whether in its original Kantian form, or in the slightly modified forms which it has assumed in Hegelianism, Neo-Kantianism, Euckenism, Bergsonism, and Pragmatism.'

The ground is also critical, though the Modernist is not so strong critically as he is philosophically. 'Modernists and Liberal Protestants are most unwisely perpetuating in the theological field a type of arbitrary and subjective criticism which the *consensus* of scholars has long condemned in the classical. They may of course be right—majorities are often wrong; nevertheless it is important to realize that the textual and historical criticism of Modernism is behind the times, not merely by one, but by two generations. No classical scholar with a reputation to lose would *dare* to deal with the text and subject-matter of an ancient historian as even the more moderate Modernists deal with the Gospels—even the Synoptics.'

But we have not time to cover the whole ground with him. Come then at once to the central matter. It is miracle. Start where you will, you find yourself there. Most of the Modernists begin there. Miracle is not; never was; and cannot be—that is the axiom of axioms. No progress till that is realized. No beginning till that is conceded. But Dr. HARRIS refuses to concede it. He sees that the delivery of all the Gospel miracles on the scrap-heap of antiquarian rubbish is both uncritical and unphilosophical—in short, unscholarly. As a scholar he will not have it.

And not for many years has it been so easy to reject it. For the confident assertions of a whole generation about the stability, inviolability, and what not, of the processes of nature, are being every day proved more and more precarious, or even demonstrated to be untrue. Scientific facts were never more numerous or more reliable; scientific generalizations were never more uncertain. If there is a man who asserts to-day that within any considerable area of observation this or that cannot be, he is not a man of scientific accomplishment.

Dr. HARRIS gives examples. 'The important psychological discoveries of Mesmer (1733-1815), which formed the starting-point of the greatest positive advance in the science of psychology which has taken place since the days of Aristotle, were derided by the orthodox science of his day because they contradicted the laws of psychology as then understood, and also (practically) the whole previous experience of civilized man. Not till nearly a century later were the marvellous facts reluctantly and ungraciously admitted, with the result that the science of psychology had to be radically reconstructed in order to admit the amazing phenomena of hypnotism and of the subliminal consciousness.'

That is the first example. More unexpected is the phenomenon of stigmatization, which follows. 'Careful investigation of several modern instances has convinced the majority of those who have given attention to the subject that the phenomenon

is genuine, though at present physiologists are not in a position to explain it. M. Paul Sabatier, a Liberal Protestant and opponent of miracles, rejected it as incredible in the first edition of his well-known *Vie de S. François* (1894), but in his second edition he found himself forced to accept it.'

Much more surprising is the third example. 'Until quite recently it was a fixed principle of biology that without a supply of oxygen gas no living organism can exist. All experience confirmed this assumption, and not a single known fact contradicted it. Yet we now know that there is a large class of organisms, technically known as *anaërobic*, which not only do not require oxygen but which in some cases oxygen actually kills. It has been necessary to revise the principles of biology in order to admit this new knowledge.'

The fourth example is that of the mathematical horses of Elberfeld. But that example need not be repeated here. It was described in some fulness in a review of Maeterlinck's *The Unknown Guest*.

Mozley has made us familiar with the phrase, 'the reversal of human judgment.' These are some of the reversals of human judgment which have taken place in things scientific. They are not all, but they are enough to prevent any modern scholar from asserting that within the realm of nature this or that cannot be. We can still say that that cannot be which contradicts reason; we can no longer say that that cannot be which contradicts experience.

One of the authors of this month's books describes himself as a preacher of the simple gospel.

'The simple gospel.' The phrase is received in these days with a smile. But if there is not a simple gospel, what is to be done with simple folk? At the beginning they were considered. Are we

not to consider them now, being so many? Let us brave the smile and try.

Let us try the words: 'He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die' (Jn 11^{25, 26}). They are very familiar words. Are they as intelligible? They ought to be intelligible. For they were addressed to Martha, the plain homely woman, cumbered occasionally about much serving. 'He that believeth in me, though he have died, yet shall he be alive: and whosoever is alive and believeth in me shall never die.' Martha was puzzled; but we ought not to be so puzzled.

For we know that there are two kinds of life and two kinds of death. We usually speak of the one kind, Jesus usually spoke of the other. Here He speaks of both. There is the material physical life, and there is the immaterial spiritual life.

To live is to be in harmony with our surroundings. Our physical surroundings are air, food, heat or cold. To be in harmony with these things is to be alive; to be out of harmony is to be dead. If there is no air to breathe, or if we have not lungs to breathe it with, we die.

Our spiritual environment is God. To be in harmony with God is to be spiritually alive; to be out of harmony is to be dead. God is holy; if we are unholy, doing sinful deeds, we are out of harmony with Him. God is pure: if we harbour impure thoughts we are out of harmony with Him. God is love: if we are unloving or even indifferent we are utterly out of harmony with God, we are dead. 'Dead in trespasses and in sins.' 'She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth.' Alive enough physically, she is spiritually dead.

Now we are born into the bodily life, and we are born again into the spiritual life. But there is a difference. We are born into the bodily life with no will of our own. In the spiritual birth

our own will is active and essential. 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God'—that is the statement to Nicodemus. 'Except ye turn, and become as little children'—that is the statement to the disciples. They are exactly parallel. To be born again is to start life anew, start it at the very beginning; it is to become as a little child again. And that can only be by an act of will. For let the wise and the simple both understand that 'except ye be converted' is a mistranslation. The verb is active. I have to do it or it is not done.

But I have not to do it alone. My will is essential, but my will is not everything. I cannot do it alone. It has often been tried, it has never succeeded. For even if I could bring myself by an act of will into harmony with God, what am I to do with my past? What am I to do with my present bad habits and evil tendencies? What am I to do with the weakness of the will itself?

I have to believe in Christ. That does it. For to believe in one (or *on* one, if you and the Revisers prefer it) is to be in harmony with one. Nowhere are we so hampered and side-tracked by the inadequacy of our English language as here. To believe, as Jesus spoke it, is to have faith. And to have faith is to throw oneself into the arms of another. If I throw myself on Christ, if I venture my life on Him, I believe in Him. And by doing so I am in harmony with Him.

And He is in harmony with God. So, if I have been spiritually dead, I become alive again. It is an act of my own will, this faith. But my will has not brought me into harmony with God. Christ has done that.

And then when I find that I am in harmony with God in Christ, I further find that the past is cancelled and the future secured. I have ventured myself on a Saviour who is able to save to the uttermost. He had power on earth to forgive sins; He has no less power in heaven.

And He gives Himself to me as surely as I give myself to Him. He is in me, my hope of glory. He is my present help in every time of need. He is to me the power of God. I can do all things in Christ who strengtheneth me. I am alive; I am alive for ever. 'He that believeth in me, even though he have died (physically), yet shall he be alive (spiritually); and whosoever is alive (physically), and believeth in me, shall never (spiritually) die.'

Why do men smile when you speak of 'the simple gospel'?

They smile because they think you mean the easy gospel. And in these days there is no thought that is more settled than the thought of the difficulty of the gospel. It is some years since a popular Methodist preacher published a volume of sermons and gave it the title of *The Strenuous Gospel*. Since that time the Christian pulpit has repeated the phrase and emphasized 'the difficulty of being a Christian.'

But the simple gospel does not mean the easy gospel. It is true that nothing seems easier than to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. It is also true that for some of us nothing is more difficult. It depends on who we are.

If we are sinners and know it, there is no difficulty. But if we are righteous and think it, the difficulty cannot be exaggerated. For the sinner has nothing to do but repent of his sins and trust in Christ to save him, but the righteous man has to turn from his righteousness.

And so our Lord demanded always the conversion of the righteous; He never demanded the conversion of the sinner. The sinner had to repent. If he repented he was forgiven. He was forgiven at once. He was forgiven quietly. He was forgiven freely and fully. But the righteous man had to turn. He had to turn from his right-

ousness. That was the difficulty. And that is the difficulty still.

There is none greater. For to turn from one's righteousness is to turn from one's self.

'The strenuous gospel.' But when is it strenuous? At the beginning. The strait gate is at the entrance. The prodigal son had no difficulty in entering. He repented and was forgiven. The elder brother had great difficulty. Did he ever enter in? The 'woman that was a sinner' had no difficulty. She kissed His feet, and He said, 'Go in peace.' Simon the Pharisee had great difficulty. Did he ever enter in?

The difficulty is at the beginning. And for those who believe in themselves it is very great. But it is only at the beginning. Once in, the way is easy.

It is easy as all life is when it has room to live. There is nothing that more impresses us with ease than the life of the tree out in the open field, nourished with the soil, freshened with the rain, swayed and strengthened by the breeze. That is the life of the believer in Christ. If it is not always found so, it is the fault of the believer. The psalmists were sometimes perplexed, sometimes distressed, sometimes in despair. But they knew that the fault was theirs. It was due to feebleness of faith. When they believed, they got liberty—liberty to grow easily. 'Thou hast brought me out into a large place.'

For the life of the believer in Christ is unlike the life of a tree. The believer has a will and he has to use it. In order that his life may be easy he must keep himself in the love of God. There are certain ways of doing that, and he has to attend to them.

There is the way of Rest. That is first, and always first. It corresponds to sleep in the material life. Now we sleep not after the day's toil but

before it. We sleep to fit us for the toil of to-morrow. After sleep we come into the world. And the freshness with which we come, the abounding irrepressible vitality of the child is our continual astonishment. We begin our Christian life by rest. We put ourselves by faith into the Redeemer's hands; we 'rest upon him alone for salvation.' And then before every new morning's service we repeat the act of trust.

There is also the way of Service. In the material life we need to exercise the body and the mind. In the immaterial life we need to keep the spirit fit by daily doing the will of God. We take up our cross every day and follow the Lord. It is not necessarily a heavy cross. Necessarily?—it has no business to be. The Saviour's cross was heavy; but just to make ours light. For us now, 'my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'

The service is manifold—some form that is most fitting for me always there. It obliterates distinctions. No sacred and secular. All is for Him. What *am* I fitted for? Let me not forget that every faculty I have is from Him and is to be employed in His service. And every faculty, as it is employed, is being trained for higher employment, for more pure and lasting service.

Then there is the way of Sustenance. In the material bodily life I need food. I cannot live long without it. In the spiritual life the spirit has also and as imperatively to be fed. What is the food of the spirit?

It is the Word of God. Take that comprehensively. It is found most accessibly, and we still think most nourishingly, in the book we call the Bible. Not equally in every book of the Bible? Perhaps not; but different appetites enjoy different sauces. In any case, first and chiefly in the Bible.

That is worth thinking about in these days. Many are feeble among us, and many sleep. They do not feed their spirits. They do not read the

Bible. You remember the Report of the Royal Commission—was it not a Royal Commission?—on the teaching of English? The commissioners said that the best teacher of English is the Bible. Ah, but it is the best teacher of God.

But how much Bible? Not much. Not much at a time. Take it in diets, as you take your bodily nourishment. How many diets in a day? Five, four, three, two? Surely two at least. What body will be sustained on less than two? Or what spirit? But the diet need not be a big one. Much better not. A full meal is undesirable. Let it be just as much as one can comfortably digest. And so rich are some of the meals which the Bible offers, that a very small portion will make a good diet.

Variety is commended in food. Do not adhere too closely or too constantly to one book. The Psalms are not as the Epistles. And the Epistles are not as the Gospels. Even the curried meat of Ecclesiastes has its use; even the sweets of the Song of Songs may be enjoyed by unjaded appetites. And if the Bible alone is to you as vegetarianism is to a meat-eater, then on an occasion, even for direct sustenance, go to John Bunyan, Thomas à Kempis, Alexander Whyte. And yet further?

Yes, further—if you know where you are and what you are there for.

But the great maintainer of the spiritual life is Prayer. It is the breathing of the bodily life.

And breathing is the first sign of life. Is the child still-born? Not even the doctor can tell otherwise than by the breathing. 'Behold he prayeth!'—it was the proof of Saul's spiritual life; what more could Ananias desire? And when the end comes, it is still the only evidence.

We watched her breathing through the night,
Her breathing soft and low;
As in her breast the tide of life
Kept heaving to and fro.

The breathing ceases and the life is ended. But he that believeth in Me shall never die. For he will never cease to pray.

He will never cease to pray. Did S. Paul forget that? 'Now abideth faith, hope, love—these three.' Did he forget prayer? He did not need to remember it. The anxious mother says, 'Now don't forget to take your meals regularly.' She does not say, 'Don't forget to breathe.' We do not need to be reminded to breathe. We breathe unconsciously. And this is prayer. It is unconscious. It is always. We pray without ceasing. There come occasions when breathing is conscious enough and even painful. It is then a wrestling with disease. And there come seasons when prayer is a terrible wrestling with doubt. But the normal prayer, the true prayer, is steady, unconscious, highly healthful communion with the Father.

Add to your faith prayer and reading and service and rest, and if these things be in you and abound, your spiritual life will be as a tree planted by the streams of water.

Thirty Years' Progress in Assyriology.

By C. J. GADD, B.A., BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON.

RELIGION.

THE period in which it has been possible to take a fairly comprehensive view of Babylonian religion falls well within our given span. It is not, of course, suggested that our present material is complete, or that the future does not hold great possibilities of accessions in detail. But nothing can well change our conception of the main features which characterized beliefs and observances from the earliest times to the latest. The continuity of these needs no emphasis; it is commonly expressed in the assertion that the Semitic Babylonians borrowed their religion from the Sumerians. This must, of course, be at least an over-statement in its crude form, even if the involved assumption as to priority be justifiable; but it is, in fact, unnecessary to attempt a formal distinction between the two peoples. The great majority of their beliefs, by whomsoever evolved, they held in common, and exceptions can best be noted in passing.

The gods of Babylonia were numberless, and appear at first sight a mere conglomerate of unconnected units. There are gods of heaven, of hell, and of the earth, though, among the latter, the Babylonians did not count the spirits of mountains, rivers, brooks and wells, after the manner of the Hittites, and of course the Greeks. In the earliest records of Sumer the strife of cities is represented as a contention between their respective gods; the god, in his own city, enjoys an establishment like that of an earthly ruler, with house, lands, chattels, and servant-gods. Such a deity might even choose to go voyaging, as when Ishtar of Nineveh desired to go down into Egypt, and Tushratta, king of Mitanni, sent her there, recommending her to Pharaoh's care. Yet the gods are not local for all that. None of the greater gods is confined to one city, and even those who appear to be so are only particular manifestations of the universal. Ningirsu of Lagash is a form of Enurta, and Enlil of Nippur is the supreme god of the Sumerian pantheon, forming, with An and Enki, a triad to represent Earth, Heaven, and the Deep. Why Enlil should

have this position is not clear; but it shows clearly that he is no local god, since the political fortunes of Nippur were never paramount in the land. Here there is a noticeable difference from later times, when Marduk of Babylon reflected the ascendancy of his city in his own absorption of the chieftaincy over the other gods, and even of their characteristics. A celebrated document, which describes various gods as being simply different aspects of Marduk, has often been cited as evidence of a tentative monotheism, whereas it is probably no more than a piece of local egotism on the part of the priesthood of Babylon. The chthonian gods were naturally patrons of agriculture and givers of increase. Ea himself was considered a god of the lower world; but chief among these primeval deities was Enmesharra, 'lord of hell and of the land of no returning.' His seven sons, who are represented in a ritual by seven heaps of flour, and Tammuz also, god of the dying and reviving year, were among this infernal company. Of the theogony of the Sumerians, as distinct from the Semites, we are as yet ill-informed, since there is no proof that the Epic of Creation ever had a Sumerian original. A distinction between the races—which may conveniently be noted here—is found in their attitude towards dead kings. Under the Ur and Isin dynasties it was a frequent practice for kings to receive divine honours and titles even before their death, and there is in existence a fairly large literature of hymns belonging to these cults. The practice soon passed away, and it is possible that too much significance has been attached to it. Perhaps it had never been more than an extreme form of adulation.

The religious literature of the Sumerians, apart from the many incantations for the benefit of the afflicted, or for the quelling of devils, is a comparatively recent discovery. It consists partly in legends about the gods and their dealings with men,—thus there is a Sumerian account of the Creation and the Deluge,—but most of it is in the form of hymns sung by the *kalu* priests in the temple services, for the exclusively public character of the worship is a striking feature of Sumerian practice. These hymns form one of the

most difficult branches of Babylonian literature, but they have certain broad characteristics which no uncertainty of detail can obscure. A very large part is played in them by lamentation of a goddess, Inanna, or Gula, over the ruin of cities or temples. While it is natural to see in these the reflexion of actual calamities in ancient times, it is more difficult to understand why this theme became, as it were, the staple of religious literature. It is probably best explained by comparison with another class of hymns, where the wailing is for Tammuz, now known to be Sumerian both in origin and in name. In this latter class of texts we find represented the grief of Inanna, or Ishtar, both sister and wife of the dead god, whom she goes to seek in the underworld, to bring him back eventually upon earth as the herald of resurrection and new life. It would be impossible here to enter into details of the story or rites of the Tammuz festival, celebrated at midsummer, when the year first begins to decline, while a similar lament was made for Enmesharra himself four months later, in Tebet, when the seasons were again upon the turn. We now possess also a good deal of information bearing upon the ceremonies which seem to have been a Semitic counterpart of the Tammuz celebrations. During the first days of the new year, in the month of Nisan, there took place at Babylon a great procession, in which Marduk journeyed to and fro between the city and Barsippa. The same was also performed in Assyria, but here Ashur took the place of Marduk, as in the Assyrian version of the Creation story. During this procession a sort of mystery play was worked out, which involved, among other things, the imprisonment of the god in a place representing the underworld, from which he had to be rescued by all the other gods, in order to bring the new year with him from the grave. In connexion with this central myth, the king, who actually played the part of the god, represented the whole career of Marduk (or Ashur), and upon this occasion was recited the Creation Epic, which told how the triumph of order over chaos, and the arrangement of the whole universe, were the work of the god's hands. There was, in fact, the seed of drama as plainly inherent in these Babylonian festivals, held in various cities, as in the Greek rites of Dionysus.

Among the priests, the *ashipu* was long the most familiar. It was his duty to relieve the sufferer

from all kinds of distempers, which were considered the work of evil spirits. This he accomplished by means of certain ritual acts, concerning which we possess ample details, and by the reciting of incantations which had power to banish malignant demons and to avert the effects of witchcraft and the evil eye. But, in so far as his healing was of physical ills, he did in fact consult a literature which embodies a good deal of empirical diagnosis, based upon careful observation of symptoms; and he was acquainted with the use of a great number of herbal remedies, themselves enshrined in an extensive botany. The *baru*, or seer, addressed himself to Shamash and Adad, as the gods of divination. His purpose was to interpret ominous occurrences, to avert their consequences, if evil, or to obtain from the god oracles in answer to the questions of anxious suppliants, as in the celebrated cases of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, who sought by this means to obtain prescience of the results of their undertakings. The professional literature of the seer survives in the 'omen texts' which formed so large a section of the Nineveh library. In these are set down an enormous number of circumstances which might be observed, all of which were ominous, and susceptible of interpretation as prognostics of the future. These phenomena were observed either in the heavens, on the earth and among its creatures, or by means of divinatory practices, such as pouring oil or flour upon water, or examining the entrails of victims slain for sacrifice; and the extensive literature devoted to them reveals an almost incredible degree of curious investigation. The *kalu*, or psalmist, was he who conducted the public services of song in the temples, whose duty was to 'appease the heart,' or avert the anger of the gods. All the hymns and liturgies mentioned above formed the repertory of these priests, and it is clear that their chants were of a sad and penitential nature, a lament on behalf of the whole people. The hymns were probably rendered in antiphons by a choir of priests, accompanied by the beating of drums and timbrels; and there are even traces of ancient music in these texts, though naturally they are now unintelligible. The covering of the sacred drum with a new skin was a peculiarly solemn ceremony, accompanied by elaborate rites with highly esoteric significations, which are expounded in documents not to be disclosed to the laity under pain of a curse.

LAW AND COMMERCE.

Light upon the ordinary social life of the Babylonians, as distinct from that of kings and priests, has been obtained from their business documents more than from any other source. At the outset of our period these were only beginning to be available for study, but, since that time, not only has much attention been devoted to the then known classes of 'contracts,' but a great deal of other matter of a similar nature has also been discovered. Commercial relations were early prominent in Babylonia, for, apart from the internal exchange of commodities, the staple products of the country, grain, oil, and wool, were not in themselves sufficient for the needs of the inhabitants, and an active trade in imports and exports must have arisen in very early times. It is only necessary to consider metals in order to realize at once how far the arm of commerce extended—to the northern and north-western mountains for silver and lead and copper, probably to Egypt for gold. Within the land itself the elaborate system of canals furnished an effective and ready means of transport for heavy goods. With this commercial activity there went, however, as is not always the case, a predisposition to 'businesslike methods,' which prompted men to keep strict account of their transactions, and the very earliest Sumerian documents which we possess are in the nature of inventories. At least one of the reasons for keeping such records is the necessity of appealing to them in case of dispute, and this, of course, postulates the existence of a system by which proven rights can be vindicated. The sense of law was therefore a prominent trait of the Babylonian character. Elaborate temple accounts were kept in the time of Urukagina at Lagash, and it is interesting to recollect that this monarch counted as the supreme achievement of his reign the legal reforms which he carried out in order to relieve his poorer subjects from the exorbitant dues claimed by the nobles and priests. In the same city many other lists and receipts of commodities date from the period of Agade, and from that of Gudea, or other local governors. The existence of laws, and of courts to enforce them, at this time is attested by the inscriptions of Gudea himself, who decreed a 'moratorium' for debts, and a surcease of proceedings in the courts, during the time that he was engaged in the solemn dedi-

cation of his new temple to Ningirsu. On practically all Sumerian sites the countless business documents of the Ur dynasty are a commonplace, and the prosperity which this flourishing commerce attests is a high tribute to the power and beneficence of the kings of Ur. Most of these documents are either mere inventories or receipts, but there survives a small number of reports concerning legal decisions in particular cases. Some slight indication of the actual law administered in these instances, and in the courts of Gudea, may be gathered from the fragments of a Sumerian code which have recently come to light. Too incomplete to yield any adequate view of Sumerian law, it yet reveals, what had long been suspected, that Hammurabi was a Justinian rather than a Solon. In cases where direct comparison is possible, however, the Semitic laws generally have the advantage of greater comprehensiveness and exacter definition. The list of commodities in which business was done at this period covers a wide range; grains, cattle, oil, liquids, wool-stuffs, pottery, wood, and metals, all find their place, some as raw material for active manufactures. But the true contract in legal form does not appear until the First Dynasty. A sort of intermediate stage is occupied by the 'Cappadocian' tablets, which constitute the books of certain wealthy Semitic traders settled near Cæsarea Mazaca. In them we find evidence of a highly organized commercial system based upon dealings in the metals and cloths which the district produced, and the export of these to Mesopotamia. This traffic was maintained largely upon borrowed money, by means of a banking system, and some of the richer merchants had very large sums out on usury to smaller traders who travelled with caravans, and disposed of their stock at what profit they could, repaying loan and interest on their return. How important and highly developed these caravan communications were can be judged by the interest which even kings, whether of Babylonia, Egypt, or the Hittites, took in the complaints which reached them that their traders had suffered molestation on the journey. The activity and direction of this traffic is also reflected in current prices of goods. Grain and oil, for example, were cheaper in Babylonia than in Assyria, while the reverse generally held good in the case of woollen stuffs and metals which were more easily imported by Assyria. Prices, of

course, varied considerably at different periods, faithfully reflecting the abundance or deficiency of supplies, and we are so well equipped with data that we can follow these fluctuations almost year by year.

With the First Dynasty, the 'contracts' take on a strictly legal and invariable form, and now, for the first time, we possess the actual laws upon which they rest. So much has been written concerning the Code of Hammurabi that there seems no need to attempt here any general description of it, or any comment upon the much discussed question of its connexion with the Mosaic law, from which it differs, at least, in this broad characteristic, that it is entirely secular, and does not rest upon religious sanctions, nor concern itself with ceremonial observances. Very briefly stated, it contains provisions relating to the office of judges, to theft and robberies, to the responsibilities of state officials, to the law of real property, to the relations of merchants and agents, and to the family. In view of the caravan system and the evidence of the Cappadocian tablets the sections relating to the principal and agent in commerce are especially interesting. The merchant did not travel on business himself, but employed an agent who derived the whole of his capital, or stock-in-trade, from the merchant, and trafficked in this under the condition of paying back the capital and an agreed portion of the profits, a custom contemplated, for instance, in the Parable of the Talents, and indeed universal in the East. The code requires both parties to keep an exact account of their transactions. If the agent did not obtain a properly sealed inventory of the goods entrusted to him, or proper agreements as to sharing of profits, he had no redress if excessive claims were made upon him. On the other hand, loss by highway robbery was the merchant's liability. Fraud by either party was severely punished by multiple restoration. The legal tariff for the hire of road transport is fixed by the code, and many detailed provisions are devoted to shipping. Thus, it was a capital crime to steal a ship; wages of boat-builders and sailors, as well as the scale of hiring-fees, are prescribed, and loss or damage in collision must be borne by the owner of the moving vessel or by the person responsible.

Undoubtedly the most remarkable event since the discovery of Hammurabi's monument at Susa has been the revelation of early Semitic laws in Assyria. In the excavations of Kalat Shargat

there were found three portions of tablets bearing a considerable number of sections of the Assyrian law as it stood in the years about 1300 B.C. It is very interesting, as significant of the complete distinctness of the two countries, to observe that these laws appear to owe little or nothing to the legislation of Hammurabi. In both collections appears the ordeal by throwing the suspected person into the river, in both the laws are preponderatingly concerned with marriage and the family, a feature which is also shared by the surviving Sumerian laws. But, even allowing for the fact that we have still only a fragment of the Assyrian code, the differences are very marked. In no respect is this more prominent than in the generally greater severity of the Assyrian laws as compared with the Babylonian. Evidently the penal clauses in the late Assyrian contracts, which enjoin some very revolting barbarities, are at any rate the echo of actual practices, even if, in their own time, they had become merely prohibitive in character. Especially noticeable in these new laws is the degraded condition of women. It would appear that the position of a wife might be summed up in saying that she was involved in all the liabilities of her husband, with little share in his privileges, and practically no claim upon his property. She is forbidden, under savage penalties, to abstract the least thing from her husband's house; she was debarred from undertaking any commissions for profit; and, in the event of his death, inherited nothing but a bare right to support from his children. Wives of freemen had to be veiled in the street, but this was probably regarded as a privilege, since it was penal for a servant or a courtesan to appear in this guise. The punishment for adultery was, of course, death, inflicted either summarily by the aggrieved husband, or judicially by the courts, though it was open to the husband to content himself with a milder animadversion, or even to forgive his wife. In either case the adulterer suffered the same penalty, and, if the wife were pardoned, he also went free. Should the husband please to divorce his wife, he had merely to dismiss her, and it was entirely optional whether he made any provision for her, or none at all, and this without any presumption of misconduct on the wife's part. So monstrous a proceeding is sanctioned neither by Babylonian nor by Sumerian law. If the position of women in a state is a test of its

civilization, we are bound to deplore the moral backwardness of Assyria in its earlier days. A similar conclusion must be drawn from the nature of the punishments imposed upon offenders. Death by drowning and even by burning, impalement, mutilation, and stripes all appear in Hammurabi's laws, but they are confined to comparatively few and especially heinous offences. In Assyria, however, they appear to have been inflicted unsparingly, and the bodily mutilations, which in Babylonia are generally governed by the principle of 'eye for eye,' were dealt out with brutal lavishness, and sometimes in revolting forms, such as splitting of the nose, and severance of the breasts. A form of punishment which meets us for the first time in Assyrian laws is that of penal servitude for short periods, or 'doing the king's service for so many months.' This *corvée* is usually inflicted over and above other penalties, such as stripes and mutilation. A typical case is that of a man who notices a slave-girl or courtesan wearing a veil in the street. Merely for failure to denounce her he is visited with fifty strokes of the rod, slitting of the ears, stripping of his clothing, and one month of forced labour—a sentence of almost frenzied ferocity. One other provision, of a different kind, is the last that can here be noticed. Should a husband die, his brothers were bound to marry his widow, from the eldest to the youngest, even though they themselves might be already engaged to marry the daughter of another man. In this event, the prospective father-in-law might either give his daughter, apparently as a second wife, and thus adhere to the original bargain, or, if not, he was bound to surrender the bride-price which he had received for his daughter. Conversely, a man whose wife died might demand from her father another of his daughters, or else the return of the bride-price. These rules bear, of course, a striking resemblance to the Levitical law of 'raising up seed unto a brother,' and have no parallel in the Sumerian or Babylonian codes.

LANGUAGE.

Philology is a somewhat arid subject, but in Babylonian studies it has a position of such paramount importance that some general remark upon it could hardly be avoided in any survey of recent work. Progress in this branch has perhaps been less striking than in certain others, but it has,

nevertheless, been considerable, and has taken, in the main, two directions. The languages spoken in the land of the rivers itself have been subjected to close study, and investigation has extended, through the medium of the cuneiform script, to the many strange idioms which were used on the circumference of Babylonian culture. Our detailed knowledge of the purely Semitic (Akkadian) tongue has greatly increased, and it is now possible to detect certain dialectical differences between the languages of Babylon and of Assyria—one more indication of distinct nationalities. Slightly different, again, is the Semitic of the Cappadocian tablets, and that of the Palestinian or Hittite princes who wrote the Amarnah letters and the Boghaz-Keui treaties. But these are points of detail, and, of course, no fundamental change in our views about Akkadian is now to be expected. The language is satisfactorily based, and holds an undisputed place in the Semitic family. It is greatly to be wished that one of the many accomplished scholars who doubtless possess large collections of material would embody some of it in a new Akkadian lexicon, which is the most urgent need of the study to-day. With respect to Sumerian, the position is very different. It is almost entirely within our thirty years' period that this ancient language has been forced to give up some of its secrets—unfortunately, by no means all. Its affinities are still entirely a mystery, for the Mongolian theories once popular have not proved very helpful guides, though it is still probable that the truth lies somewhere in that direction, even if very far removed. But the recovery of so great a mass of Sumerian literature, partly bilingual, during recent years, has done much to put the study on a firmer basis; the vocabulary has grown, and the grammar has to some extent emerged, though still beset with grave problems, for the solution of which the lack of a cognate language is sorely felt. The present position might perhaps be most fairly stated in the form that a Sumerian text can now be translated, under some reserve, without the aid of an Akkadian version. In view of a certain tendency to overestimate the progress of Sumerian philology, it is best to content ourselves with this studiously moderate claim. And, if this be true of Sumerian, it is even more necessary to display a becoming humility in speaking of the many new languages which have so recently obtruded themselves upon

the student of cuneiform writing. Strange tongues were being spoken in the mountain-fringes of the River-lands throughout their history; from the Elamites in the south-east, through Kassites, Gutians, Medes, and Urartians, up to Mitanni and the Hittites on the north-west, the cuneiform script penetrated on every hand, and wrote every language that those regions knew. In all cases we know a little, and in none are we much beyond

the stage of intelligent guessing. In the Hittite documents, for example, we can piece together a good deal owing to their queer practice of using Akkadian phrases as logograms, in precisely the same way as the Semites themselves used Sumerian. But in the native language, or languages,—for we are now faced with the suggestion of no less than eight in eastern Asia Minor alone,—we are still only at our first gropings.

Literature.

THE EARLY CHURCH.

THE Rev. B. J. Kidd, D.D., Warden of Keble College, Oxford, has written *A History of the Church to A.D. 461* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 3 vols., 58s. net, or 21s. net each vol.). In a Prefatory Note he says: 'It is a rash thing to venture another Church History. But, after studying the subject since 1886, and lecturing on it, for the Honour School of Theology, since 1902, I feel there is room for it. There are books of first-rate merit in the field by Dr. Gwatkin, Dr. Bigg, Dr. Bright, and Mgr. Duchesne. But none of them cover the whole field, in English; and none give references in any fullness. It was Dr. Bright who, in his lectures, taught me the value of references; but he ruled them out of his *Age of the Fathers*. Such references it has been my object to supply; and so to do for others what he did for me, by putting students into direct contact with the sources and enabling them to use the originals for themselves.'

That then is the differentiation. Gwatkin—to take the undoubtedly best of the books named by Dr. Kidd—Gwatkin wrote glorious English and was unsurpassable in scholarship, but he did not go so far down the history, and he did not give the references in any fullness. Dr. Kidd makes no statement without adding a footnote. And the footnotes are as accurate as the statements. We cannot read the book with the abandonment that was ours in reading Gwatkin, even if in reading we ignore the footnotes; but the great majority of those who read Church History read it for scientific not for emotional ends. This book is likely to become the Student's Standard History of the Early Church.

Is it necessary to show by example what this historian's manner is? Then take the following paragraph from the third volume. Take it notes and all, for that is essential. The time is that of Innocent I., and the controversy is with Donatism; but the immediate topic is persecution.

'Repression has been proved to be the only method so far successful in the cause of peace and good order; and we cannot wonder, though we must profoundly regret, that Augustine was at last won over to give it his countenance. It was a step not less disastrous in the after-history of the Church than the conversion of Constantine. The Fathers, as a whole, were on the side of toleration.¹ Some, indeed, had condemned persecution when they were themselves its victims, as Hilary of Poitiers.² Others condemned it on principle, e.g. Athanasius³ and Chrysostom.⁴ Others again, as Martin, Ambrose, and Siricius, raised loud protests against it when they were neither in doctrinal sympathy with Priscillian, its victim, nor in any danger themselves. And Augustine, as we have seen, was averse to it, and all for persuasion only, at first. "No one should be forced into union with Christ," he had said; "the result would only be that, instead of open heretics, we should have sham Catholics."⁵ But he yielded before the practical good that came,

¹ The ante-Nicenes (e.g. Tert. *Apol.* xxiv.; Cyprian, *Ep.* liv, § 3), as might be expected, denounced persecution: see M. Creighton, *Persecution and Tolerance*, 72 sq.

² Hilary, *Ad. Const. Aug.* i. § 6 (*Op.* ii. 538 sq.; *P.L.* x. 561 a).

³ Ath. *Apol. de fuga*, § 23 (*Op.* i. 264; *P.G.* xxv. 673).

⁴ Chr. *De Sacerdotio*, ii. § 4 (*Op.* i. 375 c; *P.G.* xlviii. 635).

⁵ *Ep.* xciii. § 17 (*Op.* ii. 237; *P.L.* xxxiii. 329 sq.), and Document No. 175.

as he could not but see, from the penal legislation of Honorius. About 408 we find him writing that, while he disliked extreme severities, he thought moderate measures were good.¹ He yielded to a fatal principle. It was fatal to Augustine himself: for he misuses "Compel them to come in"²; and, in his defence of penal laws, becomes involved in a strange confusion between providential and merely human penalties, and between moral and physical pressure.³ It was no less fatal to the honour of his name. The name of Augustine was, in after days, of great, and almost final, authority. "A sermon without Augustine," ran the Spanish proverb, "is as a stew without bacon."⁴ To think then that that great name could be pleaded in so bad a cause! and that the question between Augustine and later persecutors was not one of principle but only of its application. The severities used towards the Huguenots in the dragonnades of Louis XIV, 1643-1715, were justified simply by reference to Augustine.⁵ The other Augustine, 597-601, gave better expression to the fundamental principle of the Gospel, when he advised Ethelbert, after his baptism, to "compel" none of his subjects "to become a Christian: the service of Christ ought to be voluntary, not compulsory."⁶ And Innocent XI, 1676-89, reaffirmed this principle when he remonstrated with Louis and told him that "a man ought to be drawn and not dragged to the temple of the Lord."⁷

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF INDIA.

The first volume is now published of *The Cambridge History of India* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 42s. net). In form and in method it is like the 'Cambridge Modern History,' the 'Cambridge History of English Literature,' and the 'Cambridge Medieval History.' The general editor of this volume and the next is Professor E. J. Rapson. The History will be completed in six

volumes. The editor of the third and fourth volumes will be Colonel Haig, and of the fifth and sixth Sir Theodore Morison.

This first volume deals with Ancient India. Fourteen authors have contributed twenty-six chapters. To each chapter there is a bibliography. These bibliographies are thrown together at the end as in the similar Cambridge books. There are also in this volume six maps and thirty-four plates.

Going steadily through the volume, we are struck with one thing. The history of religion in India is the history of India, yet the amount of direct reference to religion is not very large. No country in the world demanded more space in the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*, and no country received it. It may be that the Editor considered that that work, to which reference is occasionally made, has done all that was necessary for our time. And no doubt he found it a very difficult task to bring the History of Ancient India within the scope of a single volume. It is enough to add that all that is said on the religious life of India is said with knowledge and understanding.

In such a book, the work of experts, new points of view and even new discoveries, were sure to appear. It is so even in so unexpected a chapter as that on the Aryans. In that chapter Dr. Peter Giles calls for a clear distinction between language and the people who speak it. If the proper title for the group of kindred tongues with which he has to do is Indo-European, do not imagine that the proper title for those who spoke them is the same. 'It is hardly necessary,' he says, 'to point out that in many parts of the world the speaker of a particular language at a given time was not by lineal descent the representative of its speakers at an earlier period. In the island of Britain many persons of Welsh blood, many persons of Irish Celtic and Scottish Celtic origin speak English. It is many centuries since it was observed that Normans and English who had settled in Ireland had learned to speak the Irish language and had become more Irish than the Irish themselves. It is well known that by descent the Bulgarians are of Asiatic origin, and of an entirely different stock from the Slavs, a branch of whose language is now their mother tongue. It is therefore clear that it is impossible, without historical evidence, to be certain that the language spoken by any particular people was the language of their ancestors at a remote period. The name Indo-Germanic there-

¹ 'Corrigi eos cupimus, non necari,' *Ep.* c, § 1 (*Op.* ii. 270 b; *P.L.* xxxiii. 366).

² Luke xiv. 23; for the argument built on it, see W. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism in Europe*, c. iv.

³ *Ep.* xciii. § 5 (*Op.* ii. 233; *P.L.* xxxiii. 323); clxxxv. § 24 (*Op.* ii. 653; *P.L.* xxxiii. 804).

⁴ R. C. Trench, *Proverbs and their Lessons*¹⁰, 65.

⁵ W. H. Jervis, *Hist. Ch. France*, ii. 64 sqq.; E. Lavisse et A. Rambaud, *Hist. Générale*, vi. c. 7.

⁶ Bede, *H.E.* i. 26.

⁷ L. von Ranke, *Hist. Popes*, ii. 422 (ed. Bohn).

fore suffers from the ambiguity that it characterises not only languages but also peoples. As has been suggested elsewhere, it would be well to abandon both the term Indo-European and the term Indo-Germanic and adopt some entirely colourless word which would indicate only the speakers of such languages. A convenient term for the speakers of the Indo-European or Indo-Germanic languages would be the *Wiros*, this being the word for "men" in the great majority of the languages in question.'

Where did the *Wiros* come from? Dr. Giles discusses the question once more. He concludes that their original home was 'that area of Europe which we now call Hungary, Austria, and Bohemia.'

An extremely useful chapter has been written by Mr. E. R. Bevan on 'India in Early Greek and Latin Literature.' Once more he brings out the sanity and sincerity of the Father of History. But after Herodotus comes Ctesias, who ought to have known India, but 'was a deliberate liar.' That is to say, he told the truth only when he was too lazy to invent an untruth. 'One of his most monstrous animals, the creature as large as a lion, with a human face, which shoots stings out of the end of its tail, called in the Indian language, says Ctesias, *martikhora*—as a matter of fact the word is Persian—Ctesias affirms that he had himself seen, as one was sent as a present to the Persian king! This gives the measure of the man. No doubt, his wildest statements about the *fauna* and *flora* of India can, if sufficiently trimmed, be made to bear a sort of resemblance to something real, but it seems ingenuity wasted to attempt to establish these connexions. The influence of Ctesias upon the Greek conception of India was probably great. It confirmed for ever in the West the idea that India was a land where nothing was impossible—a land of nightmare monsters and strange poisons, of gold and gems.'

More reliable was Megasthenes, but he could make mistakes. 'Among the mineral wonders of the land Megasthenes seems also to have reckoned sugar-candy, which he took to be a sort of crystal; a strange sort which, on being ground between the teeth, proved to be "sweeter than figs or honey."' Other wonders are perhaps not so wonderful. 'The forests on the upper Jhelum (Hydaspes, Vitastā), one of the companions of Alexander recorded, were full of apes, and he was told that they were caught by the huntsmen putting on

trousers in view of the apes, and leaving other pairs of trousers behind, smeared on the inside with birdlime, which the imitative animals would not fail to put on in their turn!'

Professor Rapson's own work is admirably done. So is Dr. Barnett's, Dr. F. W. Thomas's, and Professor Berriedale Keith's. The last chapter on the Monuments of Ancient India is written by Sir J. H. Marshall. It is of exceeding value and interest.

PELAGIUS.

Since the War began many patriotic attempts have been made to deny the inferiority of British to German scholarship, whether in industry or in attainment. The best denial is the evidence of the fact. And we have that. We have it now undeniably and even staringly in the latest volume of the 'Cambridge Texts and Studies.' That volume is an Introduction to *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*, edited by Alexander Souter, B.A., M.A. (Oxon.), D.Litt. (Aberd.), Regius Professor of Humanity and Lecturer in Mediæval Palaeography in the University of Aberdeen (Cambridge: at the University Press; 40s. net). This, we say, is the Introduction. The second volume, containing the text, critical apparatus, and indexes, is to be expected a year hence. The third volume, containing the interpolations, 'is postponed till the arrival of better economic conditions.'

Now listen to this. Dr. Souter himself speaks:

'It is obvious that the preparation of an edition like the present, in which an endeavour has been made to repair the undeserved neglect of four centuries, has cost much money, time and trouble. I cannot sufficiently express my gratitude to the Trustees or Managers of the following institutions or funds for the ungrudging confidence and lavish help extended to the researcher from 1906 to 1915: the Hort Fund at Cambridge; the Revision Surplus Fund at Oxford; the Schweich Fund of the British Academy; Magdalen College, Oxford; and the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland. The work has entailed nine journeys on the Continent, which occupied fourteen months in all. The collations were made with the utmost fullness I could attain, in order that I might learn the exact relationship between the manuscripts, and represent in my critical apparatus the readings of archetypes rather than those of individual

codices. I was desirous also to write part of the extraordinary history of Pelagius's commentary in the Middle Ages, and to do this properly required the preparation of a critical edition of the interpolations foisted on it.

'The book could never have been completed without the generous help of many scholars at home and abroad. It would not be fitting to record here the names of leading biblical, patristic and palaeographical authorities of our time, to whom I have submitted my various difficulties as they arose. I have tried to specify each obligation in its proper place in the body of the work. To the librarians and officials at the libraries of Aberdeen, Arras, Bamberg, Basle, Berlin, Cambridge (University, Corpus, St. John's), Dublin (Trinity College), Einsiedeln, Florence (Laurentian), Gotha, Grenoble, The Hague (Royal Library, Museum Meermann-Westreenianum), Karlsruhe, London (British Museum), Luxemburg, Manchester (John Rylands), Milan, Munich (State and University), Nürnberg (Stadtbibliothek, Germanisches Museum), Oxford (Bodleian, Balliol, Magdalen, Mansfield, Merton), Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale, Mazarine, Ste. Geneviève), Rome (Vatican, Basilicane, Angelica, Casanatense, Vallicelliana, Vittorio-Emmanuele), St. Gall (Stiftsbibliothek, Stadtbibliothek), Salisbury, Troyes, and Zürich (Kantonsbibliothek, Stadtbibliothek) my heartiest thanks are due. Nor must I forget the friends in various countries whose gracious hospitality cheered the exile's loneliness.'

German industry? It is more like the story of a scholar's life and labours in the Middle Ages.

OTHER FAITHS.

A mighty change has come over the spirit of the times when a missionary can write in utter appreciation, without one word of disparagement, and without one thought of contempt, of the religions and religious denominations that are not his own. The Rev. Gilbert Reid, D.D., is Director-in-Chief of the International Institute of China. He has passed his apprenticeship to authorship. His latest book is the work of a fully furnished mind and the outcome of a large experience of life. He calls it *A Christian's Appreciation of Other Faiths* (Open Court Pub. Co.; 12s. 6d. net).

One of the 'other faiths' is Unitarianism. And

at first it must seem anything but liberality for a Christian to call Unitarianism another faith. But the chapter on Unitarianism is one of the most appreciative in the book. Thus: 'With this dominating characteristic of independence, the Unitarian also deserves appreciation for the emphasis he places on the Unity of God. Unitarianism is thus not the product of negative and destructive criticism, but of belief that is positive and of thinking that is constructive. Its essence is the central thought of all religions. It lays a foundation for all religious doctrine in pure Theism. It directs humanity to uprightness of character by directing him to a clear, unequivocal worship of the one living and true God, and of implicit trust in His love and allegiance to His commands. Like Judaism, like Islam, like the purest form of all Religions, whether Confucian, Buddhist, Taoist, Brahman, Zoroastrian or any other, it teaches monotheism with no reservation, modification or limitation. The greatest of all religious beliefs, as affirmed by the experience of the ages, is made, it might almost be said, the one belief of the Unitarian.'

'As a matter of fact the interpretation given to the doctrine of God by Unitarians has entered into the thought and phraseology of Christians in orthodox Churches. The language of William E. Channing and James Freeman Clarke is not much different from that of many evangelical preachers. The explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity given by Joseph Cook can hardly give offence to a Unitarian, and yet this distinguished lecturer was regarded as a strong defender of orthodoxy. Without some protest from Unitarians, there would be a danger that the Trinitarian conception of God would break the bonds of orthodoxy and become a dangerous heresy. Unitarianism has, on the one side, been a stimulus to the truth that God is One, and on the other it has prevented the false thinking that there are three personalities each called God. The Trinitarian is thus warned that as the essential and indispensable truth is that God is One, so there must be no conception of the mind and no form of phraseology that would leave the impression that there are three Gods.'

SOCIALISM.

No account of Socialism, big or little, for or against, can be compared for intelligibility and

acceptability with the admirable book which Mr. Henry Sturt has written, and Messrs. Allen & Unwin have published under the title of *Socialism and Character* (7s. 6d. net). Mr. Sturt is a Socialist. There is no mistake about that. And his Socialism means something. It means much more than the slow process of evolution which some Socialists are content with. It means something like a revolution. Yet we call him sane. He has an even painful sense of the evils that must be attended to; he has a sense also of the difficulty of dealing with them so as not to do more harm than good; he has a horror of mere experimentalism; he has a clear vision of the future that ought to be; and, above all, a workable way (or at least it seems generally workable) of attaining it.

'I think,' he says, 'that a judicious advocat  of socialism will recognize that the private adventurer is not likely to be superseded entirely. Many articles which we require—clothes to some extent, ornaments and literature—are satisfactory only when they are exactly suited to the user's taste, and therefore should be produced by those who can give the closest personal attention to the making. And the same is true of persons who render services, such as dentists, and to some extent physicians. So there will always be little shops where clever workmen make boots to suit oddly shaped feet, and jewellers and goldsmiths, and studios where pictures are painted; and there will be periodicals, no doubt, and authors and publishers with nothing socialistic about them.

'Nor is socialist management well adapted to new and hazardous enterprises where fresh sources of wealth have to be exploited with no assurance of safe returns. Public authorities are not well suited for discovering and working gold-mines in Brazil or for developing commercial aviation. What they ought to undertake is work, the methods of which are well understood, and where a good market is assured so long as the articles produced are of standard quality. There can be no objection to entrusting socialist bodies with the manufacture of bread and cheese, or with the production of coal, or with transport by road, rail or canal. And yet even there we should always allow for the possibility that improvements may be discovered, and should therefore tolerate some private adventurers who may introduce novelties at their own risk.'

And again, 'It is one of the scares—a vain scare—of the enemies of socialism that it will involve a dead uniformity which will impoverish character and depress all enthusiasm. In regard to industry, at least, this should not be true. The industrial organization of the future will always be diversified by some admixture of individualism; and even definitely collectivist systems will show great variety of character. The aims of socialism can be secured in various ways, and there will probably be many theorists and many warm advocates of the various systems. In these matters it is most desirable that experiment should have a free hand, so that men may learn what system works best. Probably there will be good points in every system and none will be perfect; probably one worker will be better suited by one system and another by another. Perhaps the various systems will be advocated by preachers and writers no less fervid than those who contend for articles of faith; and there will be fanatics and missionaries of guilds and of co-operation and of semi-philanthropic trusts and of municipal agency. The multiplicity of systems will doubtless lead to some overlapping and waste of effort. But it will produce a healthy rivalry and competition: not the cut-throat competition which makes men malignant and deceitful; but the competition of gentlemen who have public spirit and are working in a public service, and feel a proper respect for the opponents against whom they are contending.'

What is his attitude to alcohol? That is the article of a standing or falling Socialism, as will yet be seen. Mr. Sturt is at least on the right side. 'There are many things in drunkenness that disgust women: the stinking breath, the vomiting, the loud, coarse, blethering talk, the clumsy, ineffective movements, the mental and moral obtuseness and selfishness. It is mainly through the increased influence of women that drinking habits are regarded with less indulgence now than formerly. In *Pickwick* they are treated as amiable and amusing, a trifling infirmity of excellent men—like taking snuff. In one of Lever's novels there is a phrase in which the hero speaks with admiration of some squires in an Irish county as "the hardest-drinking set of gentlemen it was ever my fortune to meet." In my own boyhood I remember that the sight of a notorious drunkard being trundled home through

the village on a wheelbarrow was regarded as eminently funny; I understand that the standard in English country life has now changed.'

And still better: 'The secondary comic relief of the play is given by the drinking scenes between Sir Toby Belch, Olivia's uncle, his half-baked friend Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Olivia's domestic clown or jester and other servants. Now to thoughtful persons such scenes are altogether painful. These wretched drunken men reeling about the stage, blethering and bawling their senseless tavern catches, are revolting to those who know what alcoholism really means. In the days of Elizabeth the feeling was different; "drunk as a lord" was not a merely humorous phrase, it represented a recognized privilege of the nobility. In a proper state of society Sir Toby Belch would be secluded in a retreat for dipsomaniacs. At any rate, he and his friend would not be allowed to parade their beastly vices; and, if they did, no one would laugh at them.'

Mr. G. K. Chesterton has contributed a preface to Mr. Arthur J. Penty's *Post-Industrialism* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). Mr. Chesterton's chief desire is to rescue Mr. Penty from the charge of Mediævalism. But Mr. Penty himself glories in it. 'Back to the Middle Ages' is his cry. Not certainly in any obscurantist sense—therein Mr. Chesterton is right—but still, back. And why? *Because in the Middle Ages there was no machinery.*

It is the introduction of machinery that has brought all the woe into the world of modern industry. Mr. Penty would have us scrap, not it all, but a great part of it. He would not set up hand-loomes everywhere again, but he would—well, he would see to it that Adam Smith's famous example of the triumph of machinery, twenty men occupied in making a pin, should henceforth be impossible. But how? how? how? Ah, that's the difficulty. We see the evil; Mr. Penty makes us see it. He is in dead earnest and he knows his business. But he does not, and we fear he cannot, tell us where to begin.

Mr. August Schvan makes his contribution *Towards a New Social Order* in a small book with that title (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). 'The old order changeth—has changed indeed,

is gone and done with, and (in Mr. Schvan's belief) none too soon. He says: 'The shibboleth of the nineteenth century, Democracy, has been the worst failure of all.' Again: 'So-called popular government has turned out to be a great lie, and nothing illustrates the fraudulent character of the whole business better than the urbanity with which it is carried on.' And again he says: 'When the whole practice of public life and all its institutions are founded upon true morality, not even the slyest of hypocrites will need to think it advisable to keep up that preaching from the pulpit which endeavours to comfort the poor sufferers from the injustices of this life, with the radiant hope of an unearthly paradise. The property of the Church, which, after all, was not got together for the mere benefit of its dignitaries, but because the Church was at one time identical with the community at large, can either be sold or devoted to more practical aims than to teach the congregation to take off their hats to a passing coffin.' The new order is to be Right triumphant at last over Might.

The Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., has contributed an introduction to *Rough Diamonds among the Lads* (Allenson; 5s. net). It is a narrative, written up a little, but resting in even its details on actual experience, of Mr. Robert Brymer's own experience among the young scoundrels of the Metropolis. There is not all the felicity of style of Harold Begbie's *Broken Earthenware*, but there is certainly not less emotional appeal.

The Rev. E. W. Shepherd-Walwyn, B.A., has written an account of what he considers and calls *Sensible Religion* (Allenson; 2s. net). What do you think of this as a commendation of the doctrine of the Atonement?

'I read of a French reformatory where it was the custom, when a boy was sentenced to solitary confinement in the cells for insubordination, for the Director to invite someone else to take his place. You know what a power old school customs, silly or otherwise, have upon boys. Some boy always offered to take the place of the culprit. The latter was then compelled to carry the daily ration of bread and water to the boy who was suffering for him. It soon became more than human nature could bear—the daily glimpse of that whitening face and those tear-reddened eyes,

and the echo of the boy's piteous entreaty that he would surrender, and so set *him* free. This haunted the other day and night till it became intolerable. In every case the culprit was broken, and rushed into the Director's presence in floods of tears, asking for forgiveness.

'That was the effect of one who *saw with his eyes* an innocent victim suffering for him, and therefore was forced to *realise* it. If we only *realised* what Christ bore on the Cross for us, willingly, and impelled by His unutterable love for us, it would have the same effect. We should fall down like ruins to repent at His Divine Feet, and confess to God our obstinacy and our sin.

'The point about that reformatory method of bringing a boy to penitence is that it *works*. Every reader will see that it is a supremely sensible, clever, and irresistible method.'

The Roman Church has saints, but she has not them all. Where can she, at least in these last days, offer a saint like *Vijaya Dharma Suri*? The life of that wonderful man has been written by Mr. A. J. Sunavala, B.A., LL.B., and it has been published at the Cambridge University Press, with a preface by Dr. F. W. Thomas (5s. net). *Dharma Vijaya* (to give his name as it was first given to him) is a Jain. And it must be admitted that the biographer makes out a case for Jainism, when it can bring forth so fine a character as this.

There is a charm about the 'Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought,' edited by Mr. G. G. Coulton, which is not easily explained. Several things contribute to it: one, the beauty of the book—the best Cambridge Press workmanship; one, the interest of the Middle Ages—Medievalism is becoming something of a religious cult; one, the excellent English in which the books are written.

The latest volume is a description of *Social Life in the Days of Piers Plowman*, by D. Chadwick (Cambridge: at the University Press; 10s. 6d. net). The short introduction tells us pretty well all we can be told about the authorship and origin of the poem. The dreamer's name was Wille, more frequently Longe Wille, from his height. His wife's name Kitte and his daughter's Kalote. His life was 'a hard one. His happiest recollections were of the cloister to which he had been sent in his boyhood by father and friends. As he

seems to have accepted woollen clothes in payment for copying he did for the merchants, he cannot have risen very high (which possibly accounts for his lenient treatment of the poor clerks). His marriage with Kitte would hamper his career.'

Longe Wille had the seeing eye. It is only when the poem is scrutinized closely that one recognizes the extent and intimacy of his vision. The author of this book has so scrutinized it. There is an account of the Clergy, Secular and Regular, of 'Secular Government, of Country Life, of Town Life, of the Wealth and Poverty of Society, of the Layman's Religion, and of Medieval Women.

Will Langland (if that was his full name) had an independent mind as well as a seeing eye. He was much perplexed with the problem of destiny and freewill. 'He could not definitely set aside the thought that

how I werche in this world · wrong other
ellis,

I was markid, withoute mercy · and myn name
entrid

In the legende of lif · longe er I were;
Or ellis undir-written for wykkid · as witnessith
the gospel.'

Dr. J. M. Powis Smith, Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature in the University of Chicago, is one of the surest-footed scholars and most acceptable writers on the Old Testament at the present time. His new little book *The Religion of the Psalms* (University of Chicago Press; \$1.75 net) is almost as devotionally delightful as the best of the Psalms themselves. But more to the purpose than its devotional atmosphere is the searching inquiry into such a serious matter as the Davidic origin of Psalms. The conclusion is that David had not the religion to write any of the Psalms as we have them now. Here is a paragraph: 'The situation does not improve when we move over into the theological aspect of David's religion. We begin with the bringing up of the ark into Jerusalem (II Sam. 6: 12-23). Here David is at great pains to do Yahweh honour. Nothing irreverent or unseemly would be tolerated for a moment. Yet David danced along the highway in such a state of nudity and abandon that his wife Michal observing him from a window was scandalized. Nor is there any reason to suppose that Michal, after a somewhat exciting marital

career, was in any sense a prude. But David verily thought that he was pleasing Yahweh. What sort of a conception of God did he have?'

If David wrote any of the Psalms 'they have undergone so great a metamorphosis that David himself would have great difficulty in identifying his literary offspring.'

Mr. Humphrey Milford has published handsomely a volume which will be eagerly sought after by students of Egyptian religion, and will be found very profitable to them, if they know how to read Egyptian hieroglyphics. Its title is *Thoth, the Hermes of Egypt*, and its author, Patrick Boylan, M.A., Professor of Eastern Languages, University College, Dublin (ros. 6d. net).

The title has been chosen, Professor Boylan tells us, 'partly to suggest from the beginning an important and intelligible aspect of Thoth to the general reader, and partly to remind the student that a god who, at first sight, might seem to be a divinity of purely Egyptian importance, was, nevertheless, associated with such a widely flowing current of ancient thought as the speculation of the Hermetic writings.' It is, however, more limited than the book, which ranges over a very large part of the religion of Egypt and introduces not a few of the gods, in every case to throw some new light on their character and relationship.

Throughout there are ideas which have an immediate interest for the Christian. 'The word of the thinker gives being to his thought, and, hence, the creative power of Thoth is exercised in the utterance of command. Whatever exists, then, is a creation of Thoth's heart projected by utterance into the physical reality of experience. The oldest Egyptian texts are familiar with the productive and creative power of certain spoken words. That idea underlies the magical formulae of the Pyramids. It gives a very real meaning to the votive tablets, and to the stelae of the Old and Middle Kingdoms. It is an idea which comes to expression frequently in Egyptian funerary literature. The creative power of utterance is implied in all passages which speak of magical and mysterious names of kings and gods. That speech possesses creative efficiency is a genuinely oriental notion. Among the Semites the far-reaching power of the formula of blessing or of cursing, and the deep importance of the name, are well-known. It is therefore quite

oriental and Egyptian to suppose that a word can summon a thing into being, or banish it into nothingness. The writer of the Shabaka text gives us clearly enough to understand how he conceives of creation through speech or utterance. He says: "When the eyes see, the ears hear, and the nose inspires breath, they convey that to the heart: that (viz. the heart) it is which causes every decision to go forth, and the tongue it is which pronounces what the heart has thought. It (the tongue) fashioned (thus) all the gods, and the Ennead: and every divine word also came into being through what the heart conceived, and the tongue commanded." Thus, even the ancient period associated with Thoth's creative action, the idea of a production by thought and utterance,—by Sia, if we wish to express it so, and Hu. It is important to note how, in the Shabaka text, the gods are first produced in this way, and then the "divine words," i.e. probably all such formulae as were themselves endowed with a productive or creative power.'

Messrs. Constable have issued a new and revised edition of Professor F. Crawford Burkitt's *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus* (3s. 6d. net).

The Rev. Frederick D. Kershner, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Christian Doctrine in Drake University, calls all the arts and sciences into the pulpit with him. Preaching *Sermons for Special Days* (Doran: \$1.50 net), he illustrates them from the painters and the poets, and he has the trained scientific mind at work in the construction of them. They are not to be repeated in this country; but they may be read by any person here or elsewhere with profit, and certainly with active interest.

The study of beauty should do one good. It has done good to the Rev. Samuel Judson Porter, D.D. It does good to us who read his book of *The Gospel of Beauty* (Doran; \$1.25 net). Just to keep one's mind on the thought of beauty, to let it rise to the thought of the God of Beauty, and then to the Beautiful God—that does good. And Dr. Porter does not expect us to be content with aesthetics.

The Rev. L. R. Scarborough, B.A., D.D., President of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, has published two volumes of sermons—

red-hot evangelistic sermons (Doran; \$1.25 net each). One volume, *The Tears of Jesus*, is addressed to evangelists; the other, *Prepare to meet God*, is directly addressed to sinners. On some subjects, handled gingerly by most evangelists now, President Scarborough speaks out. 'That great deceiver of the people, Russell, went up and down the land, got the newspapers to carry his damnable lies and moving picture shows to put them on the screen, and in pulpit and on platform he tried to put out the fires of hell. But that morning a few years ago when he fell dead in Texas on a flying train, and I saw the telegram that brought the news, I said, "Oh, that man who tried to put out the fires of hell, my fear is that he has a different story to tell now."'

Dr. Frank Ballard's *Why not Mormonism?* (Epworth Press; 1s. 6d. net) is somewhat timely. For we read in the Aberdeen newspapers (of all unexpected places) that on such a morning (cold as it can be in the heart of the Grampians) so many women were baptized into Mormonism in the open water.

Mr. Frank Boreham's new book is another volume on 'Texts that moved Great Minds.' The title is *A Handful of Stars* (Epworth Press; 6s. net). William Penn's text is here, and Robinson Crusoe's (for fiction is as good as biography for this purpose), and Hudson Taylor's, and Thomas Huxley's, and Janet Dempster's, and Uncle Tom's, and many more. Mr. Boreham is a large-hearted man and liberal-minded. He is very kind to Professor Huxley, whose text was 'What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' The book ends with Everybody's Text, and you know what that is.

'The intention of the present work is to take one main type—perhaps the most characteristic type—of Christian experience, as exhibited in three of its most illustrious representatives, namely, Paul, Luther, and Wesley, whose earlier struggles, and way of release, and wondering rebound of triumphant joy, were remarkably similar; to examine each case in detail, by way of comparison, largely of contrast, with prevalent types of contemporary ethics, or of systems of ethic still widely influential at the time; to make further, and supporting,

comparison with the thought and teaching of certain associates and fellow-helpers of these spiritual chiefs; and thus to determine the leading truths and principles of Christian experience and character, as illustrated by their names.'

Thus does the Rev. T. F. Lockyer, B.A., declare his aim in writing *Paul: Luther: Wesley*—a Study in Religious Experience as illustrative of the Ethic of Christianity (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). What the Ethic of Christianity is, in Mr. Lockyer's thinking, may be known to any one who will turn to 'In the Study.' For there have been quoted the paragraphs of the book which describe the Ethic of Christianity, and declare the heart of the book itself. Beyond that, what need be said? This only, that with all his writing Mr. Lockyer never wrote so aptly to the mind of his time and never so faithfully to the mind of Christ.

Mr. James Harvey Robinson, Lecturer in the New School for Social Research, sometime Professor of History in Columbia University, has written a book on *The Mind in the Making* (Harper; 8s. 6d. net). Its sub-title is 'The Relation of Intelligence to Social Reform.' But neither title nor sub-title gives any idea of the purpose or contents of the book.

Its purpose is to persuade us to change our minds. It is a good purpose. It is the very Gospel itself—or at least the clearing of the ground for the Gospel. John the Baptist came saying, 'Change your minds, for the kingdom of God is at hand.' Jesus followed saying the very same thing. Professor Robinson is in a good succession. He, too, preaches repentance, change of mind. With this difference, however, that it is not the Kingdom of God that he hopes to see coming, it is the kingdom of man. In God or His Kingdom he is not deeply interested. Change your minds—see as I see—and all will be well with society—that is his gospel. His deep distress with men is that they will not stand to be criticized. It is so unreasonable of them. Professor Robinson wants to criticize their social customs, their religious beliefs, and all else that they now think or say or do; and they resent it. 'At the outset of this volume the statement was hazarded that if only men could come to look at things differently from the way they now generally do, a number of our most shocking evils would either remedy themselves or show themselves subject to gradual elimination

or hopeful reduction. Among these evils a very fundamental one is the defensive attitude toward the criticism of our existing order and the naïve tendency to class critics as enemies of society.' It is certainly an evil, a serious evil, from the critic's point of view. Professor Robinson criticizes all round. Science and Philosophy are not let off. 'At the opening of the twentieth century the so-called sciences of man, despite some progress, are, as has been pointed out, in much the same position that the natural sciences were some centuries earlier. Hobbes says of the scholastic philosophy that it went on one brazen leg and one of an ass. This seems to be our plight to-day.'

How is Wyclif's name to be spelt? The Colleges called after him say Wycliffe. And there is this for it, that his property was so spelt. But not his name. The Rev. G. T. Shettle was Rector of Wycliffe-on-Tees for some years and investigated the point. He concludes that the proper form is John Wiclif of Wycliffe.

And with that there is the fact, also well attested, that John Wiclif was a landed proprietor, and looked well after his estate. Mr. Shettle's essay in the volume *John Wiclif, of Wycliffe, and other Essays* (Leeds: Jackson; 2s.), is a really valuable contribution to Church History. The rest of the essays are less informing perhaps but not less interesting. The essay on Warren Hastings is a fine appreciation of a very great man. The private letters here used for the first time add to the greatness.

The Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D., Rector of Bradfield, Berks, finds that the author of the Fourth Gospel selected seven (the perfect number) miracles out of all the miracles of Jesus, in order to use them towards the purpose for which he wrote his Gospel. That purpose was to commend that eternal life which is found in the Son of God and is offered to all who believe in His name. In *The Miracles in St. John's Gospel and their Teaching on Eternal Life* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), Mr. Gilbert explains each of the seven with this end in view. It is the work of a scholar and of an original, careful thinker.

Who are the *Heroines of Modern Progress*? According to Elmer C. Adams and Warren Dunham Foster they are Elizabeth Fry, Mary Lyon, Eliza-

beth Cady Stanton, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Florence Nightingale, Clara Burton, Julia Ward Howe, Frances E. Willard, J. Ellen Foster, and Jane Addams—two English and eight American women. It is a patriotic but not an exhaustive list. In a volume with the title named above, those ten are enthusiastically offered for our 'Go, and do thou likewise.' Their portraits are given; and very good portraits they are (Macmillan; \$2).

Asian Cristology and the Mahāyāna: A Reprint of the Century-old 'Indian Church History' by Thomas Yeates, and the further Investigation of the Religion of the Orient as influenced by the Apostle of the Hindus and Chinese by E. A. Gordon, Member of the Japan Society, London, and of the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch; with Sketch Map and Illustrations (Kyoto: Maruzen & Company Ltd.; 10 yen).

Such is the title page of Mrs. Gordon's new book. We are not sure why 'Cristology' is so spelt, but it cannot be a slip, for it is so spelt also on the back of the book. It is a small matter: the book is a great matter. Mrs. Gordon is a scholar, an enthusiastic, indefatigable scholar. The world owes more to her scholarship than it has known yet or acknowledged.

This is an astonishing work for a woman single-handed to produce. For the reprint of honest Thomas Yeates is the least of it. Every chapter is annotated, sometimes very curiously, always minutely and learnedly. Then the book is illustrated, sometimes by line drawing, sometimes by photographic plate, sometimes by exquisite reproduction in colour. It is a book to have whether we read it or not. But if we read it we shall possess it, and it is worth possessing.

Mr. Melrose has added to his 'Pocket Series' *Shaded Lights on Men and Books* (3s. 6d. net), being essays selected from *Peace of Mind* and *Serenity*. They are very pleasant. They remind one of the old days when essays were read as novels are now, so easily conversational are they and so innocent. The writer knows his craft. The best in the book is the essay on the Writing of Essays.

To gain a good English style read *Letters to my Grandson on the Glory of English Prose*, by the Hon. Stephen Coleridge (Mills & Boon; 4s. net).

Read it again, and yet again. The selection of passages is not to be surpassed, and Mr. Coleridge's own writing is fitting. He says: 'I alluded, in my first letter to you about English literature, to the necessity of your learning from the beginning the wide distinction between what is good and what is bad style.

'I do not know a better instance of a display of the difference between what is fine style and what is not, than may be made by putting side by side almost any sentence from the authorised translation of the Bible and the same sentence from *The Bible in Modern Speech*.

'I will just put two quotations side by side:—

"Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

"Learn a lesson from the wild lilies. Watch their growth. They neither toil nor spin, and yet I tell you that not even Solomon in all his magnificence could array himself like one of these."

: 'Here you can feel the perfect harmony and balance of the old version and the miserable commonplaceness of the effort of these misguided modern men.

'Again:—

"Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

'This is mauled into:—

"Repent, he said, for the kingdom of the heavens is now close at hand."

'These examples are perfectly suited to illustrate the immense difference that separates what is noble and fine in style and what is poor and third rate.

'If you recite the old version aloud you cannot escape the harmony and balance of the sentences, and nothing dignified or distinguished can be made of the wretched paraphrases of the two desecrators of the splendid old text.'

'Theophagy' is a terrible word. But it has to be accepted. For the terrible fact is undeniable, and even widespread—widespread through all the ages, right up to the present hour. Theophagy is the eating of your god. Let us, for decency's sake, spell god with a small letter. But Professor Preserved Smith, who has investigated the whole subject, has no squeamishness. He lays the religious festival of the Aztecs, of which the very

name was 'god is eaten,' down squarely beside the Eucharist of the Christian Church, in which we sacramentally eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God. He calls his book *A Short History of Christian Theophagy* (Open Court Pub. Co.; 10s. net).

Introducing *Christ the Life of the Soul* (Sands), by the Right Rev. D. Columba Marmion, to English readers, Cardinal Bourne says: "'Le Christ, Vie de l'Ame," has received in its original form such ample commendation both from our Holy Father the Pope and from the learned and much venerated Cardinal Archbishop of Malines that any further praise seems almost out of place. Yet very willingly indeed I add my less authoritative tribute to the more important words that they have written, and I very gladly advise all those who seek in the English language a work that will surely help and guide them on the path of closer union with their Maker, to read and study this translation of the extremely valuable treatise which is the outcome of long thought and labour on the part of the Abbot of Maredsous.'

You will agree with Cardinal Bourne when you read the book—even when you have read but a few pages of it. If never before or after, you will agree for once. One thing you will rejoice in: Abbot Marmion sees more in the things that are spiritual than in material things—sees everything there indeed. This for a typical example:

'What is it to feel oneself eternally drawn with all the natural energy of one's being towards the enjoyment of God, and to see oneself eternally thrust back? The essence of hell is this inextinguishable thirst for God which tortures the soul created by Him, for Him. Here below, it is possible for the sinner to avert his thoughts from God by occupying himself with creatures, but, once entered into eternity, he finds himself alone with God. And it is to lose Him for ever. Only those who know what the love of God is can understand what it is to lose the Infinite. To hunger and thirst for infinite beatitude, and never to possess it!'

'A purified and enlarged Christianity is destined to be the religion of humanity.'

That anonymous quotation is placed by the Rev. F. W. Butler at the very beginning of his book, *Can we dispense with Christianity?* (S.C.M.;

5s. net); and the book is written to prove it true.

But what is Christianity? It is that religion which Jesus Christ taught; it is that religion which He lived; it is that religion which He died for. And the death is essential. It is that religion, in short, which is Jesus Christ and Him crucified. For Mr. Butler feels no call to discover a new religion, or to drop out of the old religion any important element.

Yet he is quite modern. His thought is modern and his language. His world is a larger world than the world of St. John. His mind has had another discipline. The Christian religion he finds good for the modern mind, and the only good.

From the Publishing Office of the Student Christian Movement comes *A Programme for the Revolution* (1s. 6d. net). It is offered to 'Christians everywhere' by an Anglican Priest in China. The revolution is not bloodless. This is the programme for the individual:

'Every man is my brother.

'I will know no class distinctions: e.g. when I meet my friends I will salute them without restraint of class or prejudice.

'I will not be ashamed to do, and to be seen doing, what I expect others to do—the simple, serviceable things of life, or any menial jobs.

'I will follow the King's example and precept in matters of hospitality, sitting down with people hitherto regarded by my set as "publicans and sinners," and inviting those whom class distinctions have hitherto prevented me from inviting.

'I will secure a proper school environment for my children, not by paying fees which other parents cannot afford, but by throwing my whole energies, in union with my fellow-Christians, into making any and every school in this or any locality fit in manners and morals, refinement and efficiency, for every son and daughter of the Most High.

'I will belong to no party in Church or State.

'As opportunity offers, I will go to any Church or Chapel other than my own (without withdrawing my loyalty to my own), in order to worship with my fellows, in reverent acknowledgment of the King's Presence among them.

'I will do what in me lies to put an end to Christian division and dissension, not so much by argument as by union in the King's service.

'I will teach my children little by little as they can understand, the simple mysteries of birth and life. I will do all I can to throw off the blighting control of prudery from myself and others, and substitute a single-hearted reverence towards the Lord, the Giver of life.

'I will wear no mourning for "departed" friends; but seek to remember them daily, and to realize their presence with me, my presence with them, in the Presence and Service of the King.'

A book with the title of *Lives of Famous Orators* has been written by Mr. J. N. Ruffin, B.A., and published by Messrs. Taylor & Francis (3s. 6d. net). It contains extracts from the orators, and portraits of a great number of them, from Demosthenes to Lloyd George. It contains also extracts from the estimates of their oratory made by writers, whether of their own time or later. Here is—

Henry Ward Beecher's Peroration Prophesying Union of England and America in a Future War.

'And now in the future it is the work of every good man and patriot not to create divisions, but to do the things that will make for peace. On our part it shall be done. On your part it ought to be done; and when, in any of the convulsions that come upon the world, Great Britain finds herself struggling single-handed against the gigantic powers that spread oppression and darkness, there ought to be such cordiality that she can turn and say to her first-born and most illustrious child, "Come! I will not say England cannot again, as hitherto, single-handed manage any power; but I will say that England and America together for religion and liberty are a match for the world."'

In *The Graded School in Principle and Practice*, by Verona Doris Lester (Teachers and Taught; 1s. 6d.), an urgent appeal is made for the recognition of modern ideas, modern scientific ideas, in Sunday school teaching. 'One child having been told some of the earlier Old Testament stories with no suggestion of their being records of a time before people had come to know a great deal about the nature of God, suddenly said with a relieved sigh,

"Hasn't God improved since then, Mother?"'

By the same author is a pamphlet on *Some Problems and Needs of the Intermediate Boy and Girl* (6d. net).

Pindar and St. Paul.

BY RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., MANCHESTER.

It is becoming constantly clearer that in the study of the New Testament we are dealing, in the main, with a fundamentally Hellenized product, and that, as regards St. Paul in particular, neither his philosophy nor his language will be finally intelligible to us until we have taken off from him his Rabbinic robe, and moved him away from the feet of Gamaliel. He has been in that position of affected Semitism long enough. He does not, indeed, tell us of his attendance upon other University Professors, but his writings tell us, and they sparkle with genuine Greek quotations and allusions. Nor is it only St. Paul that is under the spell and magic of Greek learning and literature; we know now, what appears to have been hidden from a number of generations, that the Fourth Gospel is based upon Greek antecedents and is not, in its Prologue, a transcript of Hebrew meditations; if we are to understand it, we must find a Stoic teacher to take us by the hand, and explain to us the terms and read to us the riddle of its composition. If this sounds somewhat revolutionary, it is a wholesome revolution, and will result in a more stable theology than the schools have sometimes offered us.

But we were speaking of St. Paul in the first instance, and we recall the fact of his using occasionally quotations from Greek poets. The expositors, ancient and modern, detected for us a number of them, such as the Menander quotation in 1 Co 15, the Epimenides extract in the Epistle to Titus, and the Cleanthes-Aratus doctrine in Ac 17, whereby our kinship to the All-Father is expounded. Then there is the further discovery of an extended extract from the *Minos* of Epimenides, in Ac 17, over and above what is found in the Epistle to Titus, and the proof that it is to this author that we must refer the words, 'In Him we live, and move, and are.'¹ And what are we to say of St. Paul describing his conversion, where the Lord speaks to him in Hebrew, and promptly translating out of this hypothetical Hebrew into a corresponding Greek proverb, which may have come to him from Pindar or from Æschylus?

The case of a possible dependence upon Pindar is of peculiar interest. It would mean scholarship of a higher order than was necessary to quote the *Ion* of Euripides, as we have shown him to have done in the observation that Tarsus was 'no mean city,'² and was, in fact, a modern Athens. In the present article I propose to go in search of another Pindar quotation in the New Testament. Without committing ourselves prematurely to a Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, and using the name Paul in a general sense, we propose to show that there is a thinly disguised Pindaric quotation in the Second Epistle to Timothy.

In chap. 2⁷ we have the injunction of the Apostle to his favourite disciple:

νόει δὲ λέγω

('Mind what I am saying to you').

It will raise an incredulous smile on the face of the critic to be told that this is a quotation from Pindar. Cannot one person call the attention of another without straying into Greek literature? So simple an appeal must surely be at home in every language and every literature. Let us look into the matter a little more closely. The writer repeats his appeal; he says, 'God give you understanding in all things'; we note the word *σύνεσιν* for 'understanding,' and by means of it restore the proverbial form *σύνες ὁ σοι λέγω*. We are to show that this is Pindar, and that it is commonly introduced as such. For example, in one of the charming letters of Gregory of Nazianzus, so full of the spoils of the Egypt which he is supposed to have left,³ we find it in the form *ὡς φησὶν Πίνδαρος*, and the only thing wrong about the reference is that either Gregory or his copyists have dropped the Doric form: it should be

σύνες ὁ τοι λέγω.

When we turn to Plato we shall find evidence of the currency of the quotation; for example, in the *Meno*⁴ where Socrates and Meno are having a dialogue on form and colour, we find as follows:

¹ See *Expositor*, Oct. 1906, Ap. 1907, Oct. 1912, and Jan. 1915.

² THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Oct. 1919.

³ Patr. Gr. 37, col. 211.

⁴ P. 76 D.

SOC. Then there is such a thing as sight?

MENO. Yes.

SOC. And now, as Pindar says, 'read my meaning'; *σύνες ὃ τοι λέγω*—colour is an effluence of form, commensurate with sight, and sensible.

MENO. That, Socrates, appears to me to be an admirable answer.

In the *Phædrus*¹ we have the same quotation, though it is not commonly recognized, because Pindar is not mentioned. Phædrus is trying to make Socrates deliver a discourse; he says:

'I would have you consider that from this place we stir not till you have unbosomed yourself of the speech; for here are we all one, and I am stronger, remember, and younger than you; therefore perpend (*σύνες ὃ τοι λέγω*) and do not compel me to use violence.'

So far the quotation has been employed in a colourless manner; but enough has been said to show that Pindar is really involved, and that the Pindaric formula underlies the language of the Pauline Epistle; we must now try to get closer to the original, and, if possible, find out more about the sense in which the words were originally used.

Our next guide will be Aristophanes. When the *Birds*, in the play of that name, have succeeded in building a town in the air, to be called Cloud-Cuckoo-bury, there appears on the scene a lean and hungry poet, who wishes to celebrate the occasion, and to be paid for the verses which he sings. He proceeds to quote Pindar, we may say he is Pindar. He is doing what Pindar is said to have done at the court of Hieron, the tyrant of Syracuse. Here is the passage as rendered in Rogers' translation:

POET. Ætna's Founder, father mine
Whose name is the same as the holy altar flame,
Give to me what thy bounty chooses
To give me willingly of thine.

¹ 236 D.

The poet is promptly rewarded with a jerkin stripped from the attendant sacrificing priest. But he is not satisfied; he says:

This little kindly gift the Muse
Accepts with willing condescension;
But let me to an apt remark
Of Pindar call my lord's attention.

Out among the Scythians yonder
See poor Straton wander, wander,
Poor, poor Straton, not possessed of a whirly-woven
vest,
All inglorious comes, I trow, leather jerkin, if below
No soft tunic it can show.
Conceive my drift, I pray.

(*ξύνες ὃ τοι λέγω.*)

Whereupon the priest is stripped of his tunic also, and poor Tom, who was a-cold, goes away happy. Now the meaning of all this, as the Scholiasts explain, is that on a certain occasion Hieron had rewarded Pindar with a team of mules, and Pindar had asked for more, almost in the very terms which the poet uses in the *Birds*. He had asked in verse for a carriage to go with the mules; lo! Straton, the poor Scythian, lives in a wagon, and is thought little of if he doesn't possess one.

Apparently Pindar got his carriage, and is caricatured as a mendicant poet by Aristophanes, begging first for a jacket and then for a shirt. Here, then, we see the origin of the proverb that we went in search of. Was there a special motive in the use of the quotation which we have shown to be in the mind of the writer of the Epistle? We cannot be sure of this; there seems to be no special meaning in its use by Gregory or by Plato. If there is any such it arises out of the advice given to Timothy in the previous verse, to live at other people's charges, and to claim the first place in the distribution of a harvest. In that case it would be a broad hint to reintroduce the practice of assigning the first fruits to the spiritual men. The *Teaching of the Apostles* does the same, on the ground that 'the prophets are your high priests.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Naville on the Pentateuch.¹

IN spite of his years Professor Naville's literary activity and logical acumen remain undiminished. His last production is a reply to Professor Humbert's defence of the so-called 'critical' theory of the Pentateuch, in which the veteran Egyptologist maintains its Mosaic origin and authorship, and subjects the arguments of his opponent to a remorseless criticism. As he says, pertinently enough, there are two methods of studying an ancient document or ancient history; one of these 'is essentially German: in the study of a document what is right is not what the document itself says, but the idea or theory which it has suggested to the student.' It goes without saying that in the domain of Egyptology and Oriental archæology he gains an easy victory over his antagonist.

'An ounce of fact is better than a ton of theory,' and the German critics and their disciples would not unfrequently have been the better for a little knowledge of the facts both of archæology and of ordinary Oriental life. Professor Naville has no difficulty in showing how impossible it is to harmonize the theory of the Sacerdotal Code and the late Redactor with the facts of history and common sense. 'Admettant même qu'il se (le rédacteur) soit mis à l'œuvre très vite après l'achèvement de mosaïque en un temps extraordinairement court, et en outre il faut qu'il ait réussi à faire adopter par les prêtres de Jérusalem son texte de Pentateuque comme le texte sacré qui sera désormais la loi, et auquel aucun changement ne doit être apporté. Puis il faudra que les Samaritains en prennent connaissance et l'adoptent aussi comme leur text sacré. Auraient-ils reconnu l'autorité d'un loi toute récente et qui aurait été imposée aux Hébreux on ne sait pas par qui et à quelle occasion?'

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

Are the Gospels in Verse?

WE bring to the notice of students of the N.T. a remarkable theory of the literary structure of the four Gospels, advanced in April 1921

¹ *La Haute Critique dans le Pentateuque*, by Ed. Naville. Attinger, Paris, 1921.

by P. W. Schmidt, a corresponding member of the Vienna Academy of Science (*Der strophische Aufbau des Gesamttextes der vier Evangelien*, Vienna, 1921). He claims to have discovered that the whole of each Gospel is written in *strophes*; that the *strophes* are artistically arranged in *pericopes*; that in their turn the *pericopes* form groups; and that each Gospel is an architectonic structure of such groups. The two last points have yet to be thoroughly investigated, but of *strophes* and *pericopes* the author has no doubt.

That portions of the Gospels admit of strophic analysis was maintained already by such scholars as P. Lefranc (1906), D. H. Müller (1908), P. Szczygiel (1911), and E. Norden (1915). They, however, found strophism only in the discourses or sayings. In 1920 R. Schutz pointed out that often the narrative portions could be similarly analysed, and H. J. Cladder and P. Rohr worked at the same idea. But all these based the determination of the *strophe* on parallelism in the subject-matter of the passage.² Schmidt thinks he has found and can demonstrate the objective characteristic and formal identification-mark of the verse, independent of the thought-content altogether.

In considering the strophism which Schmidt has discovered, we must dismiss from our minds all thought of what constitutes 'verse' according to Western ideas. It is not a matter of rhythm. It has absolutely nothing to do with regularity of length of line. We have all noticed rhythmical passages in the N.T., but rhythm has really nothing to do with the Schmidtian *strophe*.

The important question is the determination of the unit, namely, the line. What constitutes a line? According to Schmidt the line is marked by a verb or verb-equivalent, although in certain cases there are lines constituted by nouns, and by phrases without an expressed verb. In general it is the verb that is the constitutive element of a line. A series of substantives, even grammatical 'subjects,' may appear in one line; on the other hand, a verb by itself, even if it have the same subject as the preceding verb, constitutes a new line. But note some exceptions. Prosthetic verbs are taken to make with the main verb only one

² Schmidt is apparently unaware of the important English work of Dr. Briggs on this subject.

line. So with verbs which are synonymous or in their combination express only one idea. So with the common collocations 'he answered and said,' 'he spake saying,' and the like. The introductory 'and it came to pass' does not make a line.

A line may thus be either a clause or a single verb. Nouns constitute lines though there is no verb when they are—(a) vocatives forming no real part of the succeeding sentence; (b) lists of personal names arranged in pairs; (c) very emphatic and admitting of consideration as elliptical sentences. Participles are difficult. Schmidt lays down that a participle constitutes a line when it is not the subject of the sentence and has true verbal force; that one participle dependent on a *verbum sentiendi* does not make a separate line; but that if there are more than one, each does so.

Phrases introduced by ἀλλά and felt to be elliptical clauses, and all introduced by εἰ μή, make lines. So do words in *oratio recta* though they include no verb, after a *verbum dicendi*.

Having thus determined what makes a line, Schmidt proceeds to describe the *strophes* into which such lines are formed. Distichs hardly occur at all. Tristichs are rare, but Mk 10¹³⁻¹⁶ is a good example:

1. And they brought young children to Him,
That He should touch them;
And the disciples rebuked them.
2. But when Jesus saw it,
He was much displeased,
And said unto them:
3. 'Suffer the little children to come unto Me,
And forbid them not:
For of such is the Kingdom of Heaven,' etc.

Other two similar *strophes* conclude the *pericope*.

By far the most common *strophes* are the 4-line (frequent in Lk.) and the 6-line (common in Mt. and Mk.), while one of 7 lines is characteristic of Jn. Fairly frequent in Lk. is one of 8 lines. One of 9 lines is common in Mt. and Mk. in connexion with solemn occasions, e.g. the institution of the Lord's Supper. 5- and 10-line *strophes* are rare; 12- and 14-line examples occur.

There is a complication about 'compensation' into which we need not enter.

The results of this discovery, Schmidt thinks, are important. The whole Synoptic problem must be reconsidered. The historicity of the Fourth

Gospel is confirmed. There can be no interpolated clauses in our Text, for if you remove the suspects, you destroy a *strophe*.

Why were the Gospels so written? Well, the strophism served a mnemonic purpose, and it was a far more artistic way of helping to secure accuracy of reproduction than the other plan of counting words and letters.

What are we to think of it all? We must at any rate pay our tribute to the enormous labour and the great ingenuity of the discoverer. But we are not satisfied that the whole business is not more a revelation than a discovery—a revelation just of the author's ingenuity. Curious things have resulted before now from examination of the Gospel Text. By counting words, by attaching their numerical values to the letters, and so on, striking results have been attained in which we have no more faith than in the wonderful Baconian anagrams in Shakespeare. Is this discovery of that order? We are by no means prepared or even inclined to say so. We have before us only a preliminary sketch, and should like to see the thing more fully worked out than it is in the selected striking examples which Schmidt adduces.

The theory, we think, deserves serious attention and examination. Meanwhile we confess to considerable doubt.

1. The preface to Lk. is in classical Greek, but admits of strophic analysis. We should say that it is not improbable that a goodly part of other classical Greek would be just as likely to prove to be strophic. Seeing that the line is indifferent to the number of words it contains, that rhythm and regularity do not matter, that the *strophe* may consist of any number of lines from 2 to 14,—and there is no reason for stopping there,—and that the *pericope* may contain variety of *strophes*, we can see nothing to prevent the strophic analysis of any prose written in simple straightforward style without parentheses or involved structure. We have made an experiment, and beg to announce the discovery that the first paragraph of *The Pilgrim's Progress* consists of seven tristichs! Nay, more:

Let our readers make an experiment for themselves;
Let them write a few plain sentences
Such as might form part of an ordinary letter.

They will probably find to their surprise
That their prose may be analysed into Schmidtian *strophes*,
Just as ours here is in tristichs.

In the actual examples given we note a rather tell-tale inconsistency. 'He will come and destroy the husbandmen'—in Mk 12⁹ these words are treated as one line, the same words in Lk 20¹⁶ are taken as two lines. Is a verb prosthetic or not just as the *strophe* requires?

2. That such strophism as this was a Semitic notion of verse-form is a big assumption: That the Evangelists deliberately introduced this Semitic conception into a Western language and into books read mostly by people whose ideas of verse were totally different, that such strophism would ever be recognized by any but a few of the readers and the transcribers of the Gospels—all this is an hypothesis which seems to us very improbable. It appears to us that the theory requires us to believe that our Greek Gospels are nothing but close translations of four Aramaic Gospels, and this not merely necessitates reconsideration of the Synoptic problem, it makes it unthinkable.

3. As to how this discovery is to help N.T. criticism—that seems to us very questionable. Strophic criticism of the O.T. has been such that we doubt if it will impress any one as a welcome new instrument to apply to the Gospels. That it confirms the historicity of Jn. we fail to see. Rather do we feel that it reflects upon the historicity of all our Gospels. Did Christ and His interlocutors converse in *strophes*? In His discourses, answers, and prayers, was our Lord concerned not to spoil the *strophe*? If not, then on this theory we have nowhere *ipsissima verba*, but everywhere an artificial manipulation of them.

4. That such strophism as this could possibly help the memory of any human being is, we think, absurd.

5. Such are the difficulties which this theory suggests to our mind. Another, of course, lies on the surface—Schmidt himself is fully aware of it—How did it happen that this strophism lay unnoticed for over nineteen centuries? Eastern as well as Western scholars during that long period have minutely studied the Text. If this strophism be really a genuine Semitic verse-form, why has no Syrian ever been able to observe it? We are tempted to raise the question, Were the writers of the Gospels themselves aware that they were writing *strophes*? If they were, their literary fate has been one of the most tragic we know. This wonderful artistry of theirs aroused no interest, received no attention, evoked not a single comment; in short, was observed by not a soul, until, after ages had rolled, Schmidt arose to do them belated justice. This is not sarcasm. Schmidt deserves none. He is as modest as he is in earnest about his discovery. But, as he admits, the difficulty is there. If this strophism were ever intended and ever recognized, how did it become so immediately and so completely a hidden secret?

To avoid misunderstanding, let us state that we fully accept what is coming to be the generally held opinion, that behind our Greek Gospels there lie extensive Aramaic materials, and we think it not unlikely that some of this material may have had a certain strophic form. We quite admit that in the Gospels, as elsewhere in the N.T., there are strophic passages. What we doubt is that Schmidt's theory of the 'verse' is a tenable one, and that the whole of each Gospel is strophic.

W. D. NIVEN.

Aberdeen.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Man of Perfect Service.

'I have given you an example, that you should do as I have done to you.'—Jn 13¹⁵.

'Whatsoever you do, do it heartily, as to the Lord.'—Col 3²³.

Boys and girls, which do you prefer—a sermon or a story? I need hardly ask that question—need I?

Well, to-day I am not going to preach a sermon. I'm just going to tell you a story. I'm not going to give you even a text. That is to be your share of the programme. For, when you have heard the story, I want you to think about it, and after tea to-night, when everything is quiet and you have time to spare, I want you to get out your Bibles and hunt for the texts that fit the story. Perhaps I should warn you that there are several texts that

fit. But the two special texts I have in mind are—well, I'll give you a broad hint—the first is in the Gospel of John, and it's more than half-way through the Gospel; the second is in Colossians, and as that book has only four chapters you won't have far to hunt, especially if you take my advice and skip the first two.

Then if you will just write down the texts you think most suitable on half a sheet of paper, and put your name and address under them, and hand in the papers next Sunday, I'll tell you the following Sunday how many of you found texts to fit, and especially which of you have hit on the two texts I'm thinking of.

And now for the story. In a little mountain village of Serbia there lives to-day a man called Marko. He is only a poor peasant, but he is the best loved man far and near in all the countryside, and he is known as 'the Man of Perfect Service.' What a strange name! How did he get it? What does it mean? And why is he so beloved? Listen.

Before the Great War, Marko was just a very ordinary man—not particularly good, not particularly kind, not particularly loved by anybody. But the War broke out and he marched away to battle, like all the men of Serbia who were able to fight; and when the War was over he came back to his little village another Marko, a new Marko, the wonderful Marko whom every one now respects and loves. And here is how the old Marko was changed into the new Marko.

He and nine other privates were told off to be orderlies to a certain general and his staff. They had to dry and clean the officers' boots; brush their uniforms, polish their belts and buttons, sweep and dust the hall, fill the water-jars and attend to the fire. But, alas! Marko and his companions did their duties anything but well. They shirked those they could shirk and scamped those they could scamp, till the officers were forced to complain to the general.

So one day the general called the ten before him and looked at them very straight. 'Brothers,' said he, 'you are called to do service to me and to my officers. Do it perfectly and joyfully.' Then he dismissed them. For a short time after that the ten did improve; but the War dragged on and on, and they grew wearier and wearier, and began to long more and more for home. Every day they talked of the mountains, and every night they

dreamt of them; and the more they talked and dreamt the slacker they grew in their work, till the officers could stand it no longer, and once more complained to the general.

That night as the ten were settling down to sleep the general drew back the flap of the tent and looked in. 'Brothers, are you all right?' asked he, and walked away. 'All right, indeed!' grumbled Marko loudly. 'Why is *he* a general, I'd like to know? He does nothing. We do everything. It's easy enough for *him*!' Then he rolled over and fell sound asleep, as did all the other nine.

They slept sound and long next morning, but when they sat up, grumbling as usual at the thought of the day's work, what was their amazement to see standing in rows in the tent their own and the officers' boots, all cleaned and ready to put on. They rubbed their eyes and looked again, but that was only the beginning of wonders. In the officers' rooms all the uniforms were brushed and hung up, all the belts were shining, and all the buttons glittering. Not only that, but the hall was swept and dusted, and a great fire was burning on the hearth. It was a miracle. All day they talked and marvelled, but they talked and marvelled even more when they woke the second morning to find the miracle repeated. They began to tell each other stories which they had heard when they were children—stories of elves and fairies who did the housework while the household slept. Some of them even thought that God might have sent an angel to do their tasks, but others shook their heads and said 'No,' that was impossible. At last they agreed that they should take turns to keep awake and watch. Soon after midnight, the man who was acting sentinel saw a figure steal quietly into the tent, and his cry of astonishment woke the others with a start, for lo! it was the general.

Next morning Marko was sent for by the general. He went trembling, for it was plain that his chief had heard the rude remarks of two nights before. But, surprise of surprises! the general was not frowning; he was smiling.

'Brother Marko,' he said gently, 'did you ever read the story of how Jesus Christ came to earth? Yes! Well, read it again to-day, and note how He who is the Captain of men, the Lord of lords, the King of kings was the perfect servant of man.

'Two nights ago, brother, you asked why I was

a general. I am going to tell you why, now. I am your general not only because I am supposed to do the duties of a general—which you consider nothing—but because I am supposed to be able to do perfectly the service which you privates are called to do.’

The general paused for a moment and bowed his head. There was an awful silence, and Marko wished that the earth might swallow him, or a bullet come along and make an end of him, he felt so ashamed. Then the general raised his head again, and continued: ‘Brother, we must do our duties, not because we are ordered to do them, or cannot escape doing them, but because of the joy hidden in doing them well, the joy of perfect service. I enjoyed cleaning your boots, Marko, for I was repaid for doing so. Every service perfectly done hides a perfect payment, because it hides God in itself. That is all, brother. You may go.’

After that need I add that neither the general nor the officers had to complain of the service in the camp. And when the War was over and Marko returned to his home among the mountains he carried with him the ideal of perfect service. To-day if any one in his native village or in the country round about wants help of any kind they have only to go to Marko. He never fails them. And so beloved is he that when the last election came round and the people had to choose some one to represent them in their Parliament, with one voice they chose Marko. But Marko shook his head. ‘No,’ said he, ‘that post is for generals. I am a private still.’

Boys and girls, do you think you can find me either of those texts? ¹

A Letter for You.

‘I write unto you, little children.’—1 Jn 2¹².

Here’s a letter come for you! Did you know that? A letter all your very own! Isn’t that exciting? It always is, isn’t it, to get a letter? It feels so big and grown-up and important to read one’s own name on the envelope, really and truly, and not just pretending; to be not just allowed to open it; for it’s yours. And no one else, not even father, has the right to touch it—no one—except you.

The other day father wrote some of you wee

¹ For the story of Marko the writer is indebted to the *Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 128, pt. i.

folks, and you wouldn’t part with it; you carried it off to bed with you: and when mother came to look at you before she went to sleep, there in your hot little hand was still clutched tight the precious letter—your letter!

Well, here’s one come for you. It’s rather exciting, isn’t it? And you would be far more excited if you knew who sent it. It’s always grand, yet a letter from some folk is far better than from others. I knew a little girl who once during the war wrote to Lord Kitchener, the great soldier. And though he didn’t know her, he answered her, and she was sinfully proud. If I remember properly, it wasn’t specially pretty writing, and it wasn’t very long, but it was from Lord Kitchener, the great Lord Kitchener, about whom every one was speaking, and whose picture was in all the papers. She read it and re-read it; she showed it to every one; she carried it about until it fell to bits; and the last I saw of it it was held together with sticking plaster.

But this of yours is a far more wonderful letter, from a far more wonderful Person. From whom? Guess. I’ll give you twenty guesses. Mind it’s from the greatest and nicest Person in the world. No, better than that! No, far nicer than that! No! no! no! Well, I’ll tell you; it’s from God. God has written to you; isn’t that a letter worth the getting? When Dad writes mother, sometimes he encloses a wee one that drops out for you. So God, writing to the big grown-ups, puts in a wee note, and says on it, This is for my own wee lassie, or for my own-lad. This is a bit of the Bible that is all your own and no one else’s. ‘I write unto you, little children.’ Isn’t *that* exciting? A letter from God! a letter for you! Whatever does He say? Well, *you* must open it. It’s yours, not mine. Your name is on the front, and I hope you’ll be quick and let me read over your shoulder. What does He say? Let’s look. I’m sure it’ll be a splendid letter, because God is so nice. You always know that mother’s letters will be splendid, because mother is mother, and there is no one like her. No one—but God. But He’s nicer still. What does He say? You read it:

‘MY OWN DEAR LITTLE CHILD,—I write to tell you that all your sins are forgiven.—With love, from your own FATHER.’

Well, that *is* a nice letter, isn’t it?

You know what forgiveness is? What a glorious

thing it is He has given you! Sometimes you've done something wrong. You promised mother you would go to bed at such and such an hour, before she went out for the evening. And you forgot, or perhaps you didn't forget; anyway you didn't go until a good bit after when you said you would. And you felt horrid and ashamed and miserable; and everything was black and wretched, and you wished you hadn't done it. If only you had known how wretched it would be, you would never have done it. And then mother forgave you! And what a difference that made! It was like when the sun comes out on a grey sloppy day, when you had to stay in, and it rained and rained and rained, and your nose got quite flat with being pressed against the window-pane; and then suddenly it stopped, and the sun shone, and the raindrops on the fences glistened like gold, and it was on with your boots, and out at last. Well, it felt like that. You were as cheery as a cricket. It is a splendid thing forgiveness. And that's what God sends you. All the naughty, sulky, selfish things you've ever done He forgives them. There couldn't be a better message than that.

Why ever has He done it? He tells us. It's for 'His name's sake.' I wonder who the He is? He must be the dearest person, don't you think? Perhaps it's God Himself. Perhaps it means He forgives you just because He is your Father, and, of course, He is not cross and angry, but loving and kind. He's your own Father, and you are His own child. For His name's sake He does it.

But perhaps the He is Jesus. Perhaps He's done this for Christ's sake, as a kind of present to Jesus, to please Him as well as Himself. And that reminds me of this story. They tell me—I've never seen it—that in Paris there is kept a huge book in which were entered all the taxes to be gathered from each town, and village, and city, and hamlet in all France. Here, among the C's, was 'Calais': and all the folk at Calais had to pay was entered there; and here, among the O's was a page headed 'Orleans'—many pages—and all the Orleans people had to pay was entered there; and among the D's there were some pages with the heading 'Domremy,' and there were entered long lists of the taxes that that village had to pay. But across it, they tell me, there was written in red: 'Free for the Maid's sake'—Joan of Arc, the Maid, was born there; and out of gratitude to their great townswoman, who freed France from

her enemies, the people there were let off all their debts to the State. Well, we are told in the Bible that there is a great book kept—many of them—and all the nasty, evil things we do are entered in them day by day. There are some pages with your name on the top, and all the naughty things you've done are there: that time you were sulky, when you wouldn't play, when you were cross, when you said what wasn't quite true—they are all there. But across them is written in red, 'Free for Christ's sake.' Perhaps that's it, don't you think?

At any rate it's Christ who brings us this glorious letter. God wrote it. It's God who forgives you; it's God who says to you, as you sit sulky and unhappy, 'Come, little one, let us be friends again. I have forgiven and forgotten it all.' He's the dearest and kindest Father. The message is His; but it's Jesus who brings it to us, and for that we must love Him too. Out at the front I used often to wonder at the 'runners,' the men who carried messages to and fro up in the front line where the shells were falling. They would be lying in a 'pill-box,' and an order would come: 'Runner wanted,' and at once one would rise and start off through the dark and danger to the officer who had to get the message. Always, they were in danger there, alone; often they were hit; sometimes they were found lying dead. But they dared everything to get a message through. There were no braver, no more utterly unselfish men, in all the army than the runners. And when God said, 'Who will take this message for Me, who will let these children know that I'm not cross or angry with them,' Christ said, 'I will.' And He did it. It cost Him His life on Calvary; for lots of people didn't want us to know about it, tried to stop Him, so that we might never hear. It cost Him His life. But He brought the message through, from God to you.

Isn't it a wonderful letter, this that has come to you? Wonderful because it's yours. Look, it's your name and your address upon it. Wonderful when you think who sent it. Fancy God making time to write to a wee bit lad or lass like you! Wonderful because of the glorious news it brings; wonderful because of the great Messenger who got it through to us. I think that, like my small friend and Lord Kitchener's letter, you should prize this one that has come to you, and treasure it, and take it out and read it and re-read it, till

you also have to fasten it together lest it fall into bits. A letter from God, and all to you!

The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Vision.

'He saw in a vision.'—Ac 10³.

There are four words in Scripture translated 'vision.'

1. The first word means 'to gaze at, to perceive, to behold, look, see.' Those who do not, get no vision. Seeing is an art which brings far more knowledge than mere book-study. In Samuel's day the people would not open their eyes to see, and so they had no seers. There were no prophets. 'Where there is no vision, the people perish.' And the vision can only be had by cultivating the art of expectation. That is what the motto really means. Contemplation brings revelation.

2. The second word means 'to see something beautiful.' It is easy to see the ugly, the vile, the bad. It is only a spiritual genius who can see some beauty in ugliness, and something worthy in the most unworthy. The legend contains the suggestion of truth which tells us that only Christ, among the observers of the carcase of a dead dog, remarked, 'What beautiful teeth!' Only the trained eye—the eye touched with the finger of God, can see the mountain thronged with chariots and horses. To others it is nothing but a bare, bleak, barren hill. That was why Ezekiel saw 'the glory of God in the midst of the jealousy' (not in the jealousy, but in spite of it). No power can ever supplant God; and wise is he who, in everything and everywhere, looks for the evidence of His working and grace. And there is no place where it cannot be found.

3. The third word means 'to see something beautiful to be.' The development of the word is as follows: to see something beautiful, comely, handsome, goodly—something that can be held as a pattern worth copying—something that reflects the best, as a mirror, a looking-glass.

The mirror is suggestive. Look in this mirror. What do you see? Yourself. Is it beautiful? The gift of vision is to see something beautiful. Apart from all vanity of appearance, is there any real beauty in your character? It is wonderful

how ready people are to forget plain features in a really beautiful character. 'Handsome is that handsome does.' In the language of the poet Donne:

The eloquent blood spoke in her cheeks—
And so distinctly wrought,
That we might almost say
Her body thought.

Will it surprise you if I remind you that this word has the suggestion of a spy? A spy is one who must be unusually clever in detecting things, and he is willing to face all dangers to gain his end. Well, in the quest of the beautiful we are to be like that.

We are to be spies. It is the Christian inquiry for the best in others, the search for the pearl in the oyster, the coral in the depths, the gold in the quartz, the search for the best. What a magnificent vision!

What an inspiring quest, to find the best in everybody, and in everything; to believe that there is something worth loving in even the meanest creature you know; to believe that your worst enemy may be won by love—your love! Oh! it is a great thing so to be able to live that with the keen eyes and ears of the alert spy we shall be on the look out for only the best, the beautiful in every one. In this Christ has set us a wonderful example. He saw Zacchæus to be a large-hearted philanthropist when others saw him to be but a mean money-grabber.

4. The fourth word means 'to see something beautiful to do.' There are many who see, but who see not the beautiful; and there are others who are admirers of the beautiful who seldom do anything beautiful themselves. The fullest and best meaning of the word 'vision' is 'to see something beautiful to do, and to do it.' The genius of the seers, the prophets of old, was that they saw, they heard, and they did.

We have seen that the first word meant 'to gaze at.' Some people do nothing else. With them it is the empty stare of negligence. There is very little grace in a mere gaze. The real process is to see, to heed, to do.

You remember the disciples standing on the Mount of Olives, after the ascension of Christ, how they kept their eyes fixed on the cloud which had received Him out of their sight! As they stood thus the angels touched them, and said,

'Why stand ye gazing into the sky? Go to Jerusalem, and tell what you have seen.' That is the Divine message always to Christians—not gazing, but going; not contemplation, but consecration; not rapture, but readiness for service; not stars, but souls; not clouds, but courts. 'Go ye, and tell what ye have seen.' That is the beatific vision.

'Hadst thou stayed, I must have fled'; and because the monk neglected not the drudgeries of his daily duties, he had 'the vision splendid.'

Singularly enough, there is a picture in this use of the word which suggests a vulture, from which, indeed, the vulture gets its name. Now a vulture has two special powers—sharp sight and rapid flight; and we know how these are used to pounce upon its prey. We too possess, or should, these very powers—or at least we should be zealous in the cultivation of them—but for a different purpose. Not to kill, but to help. Sharp sight—that is eagerness to see. Rapid flight—that is eagerness to help.

God grant us wisdom in these coming days,
And eyes unsealed, that we clear visions see
Of that new world that He would have us
build,

To life's ennoblement, and His high ministry.

Only have vision and bold enterprise!
No task too great for men of unsealed eyes;
The future stands with outstretched hands.
Press on and claim its high supremacies.¹

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Women in the Church.

'Let your women keep silence.'—1 Co 14³⁴.

Is there any definite principle upon which the sphere of women in the Church can be determined? The solution of the difficulty can be found only by the frank acceptance of the fact that there is no objection in principle to the admission of women to any of the functions to which laymen are admitted in the Church, and that there are no legal restrictions upon the services of laywomen other than those which apply to laymen. This proposition possibly may be opposed from the standpoint of Scripture and of Church tradition, of sex and the effect which such a proposal might have upon reunion.

¹ Fred A. Rees, *Honour and Heroism*.

First. It may be argued that such a proposition is not in conformity with, but rather is opposed to, the teaching of the New Testament. It may be shown that Christ dedicated His ministry only to men, and that our Lord never was known to commit any definite commission to women. I admit the strength of such a contention; but if our Lord's teaching is examined as a whole, I venture to think that there is not a sentence of His which by any kind of implication could be thought to oppose the statement that in His Church the position of women was equal to that of laymen. On this question St. Paul's teaching is quoted, especially his statements 'let your women keep silence' (1 Co 14³⁴), and 'every man praying or prophesying having his head covered dishonoureth his head, and every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head.' On this question let me quote some words by a distinguished scholar and High Churchman, Canon Mason of Canterbury. He said: 'Prophets and prophetesses alike were both to prophesy and pray aloud in the assembly, but the prophetess was not to forget she was a woman, and behave as a man. She was to cover her head while she made her voice heard. When later he bids women keep silent, it is unnatural to suppose he withdrew a permission so recently acknowledged. The simplest interpretation is that he will not allow prophetesses to rise to utter a revelation received while another prophet was speaking. That was not consistent with the position of women.' There are other interpretations of the passage quoted, but Canon Mason's opinion is held by others of equal eminence, who give the same interpretation as he does.

Surely St. Paul's teaching in Corinthians must be viewed in the light of that to the Galatians (Gal 3): that 'there is neither male nor female, but ye are all one in Christ Jesus.' Bishop Lightfoot's paraphrase on this text is worth quoting: 'In Christ ye are all saints; every barrier is swept away. No special claims, disabilities respecting sex, exist; for in Him none can exist. The conventional distinctions of religious caste or of social rank—even the natural distinction of sex—are banished hence. One heart beats in all, one mind guides all, one life is led by all, ye are all one man; ye are members of Christ.' Ramsay, commenting on the same passage, and contrasting it with that quoted from Corinthians, says that the

real reason for the difference is to be found that in Antioch and Iconium the position of women was one unusually high and important, and that they were often entrusted with offices and duties which elsewhere were denied them. Hence the allusion to the equality of the sexes, and the perfect form which the Church must ultimately attain, would not seem to the people of Galatia to be so entirely revolutionary. Holy Scripture must be regarded as the supreme authority on this and on all questions of faith and order; but the teaching of St. Paul must be read and interpreted in the light of the New Testament as a whole. His statement in Corinthians must be governed by the one in Galatians, which is borne out by the teaching of the rest of the New Testament.

Secondly. With regard to the custom of the Church. Church history makes it clear that down the ages two forces were at work, one seeking to utilize the services of women, to extend those services, to recognize them; the other tending to put women on one side, to keep them completely in the background and accord them no real voice in the management or government of the Church. It was not surprising that the latter of the two forces gained the upper hand when it is realized that women throughout Europe had no political status, that the Church, represented by the Church of Rome, gradually became more and more political and more powerful, and was inclined to rely upon the male population, who really governed the situation.

Thirdly. It may be argued that women are incapable of exercising the same functions in the Church as laymen owing to their sex. But surely a great change is coming over the attitude of the public mind towards the position of men and women. This change of attitude had grown and expanded during the war in every direction; and when we contemplate the work which laymen or women can do in the Church, is there anything in that work incongruous with the life of a true woman of God? Would it unsex a woman to be put upon an equality with a layman in the Church of Christ?

Fourthly. It may be objected that any such attempt would retard reunion with the great Churches on the Continent. Can any one prophesy as to what grave changes are likely to take place within the Orthodox Church within the next few years? If ever reunion comes, it will result

from a different kind of Christendom in Europe from that of to-day. It will not be a Christendom as represented by the Orthodox Church, or by the Roman Church, or even by the Anglican Church. It is probable that when the time arrives for reunion there will have been a vast change over the whole situation, so that a question such as this will loom very small and seem very petty in the light of the great reunion then contemplated. We need not fear that any question such as this will ever for a moment retard reunion when the time arrives for such a glorious event.¹

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

No More Curse.

'There shall be no more curse' (RVm. 'No more anything accursed').—Rev 22⁸.

1. There is no doubt whatever that many of the human shadows that blot out the sun and make our feet stumble are *gratuitous*, and may be got rid of whenever man pleases. That this condition, 'whenever man pleases,' is not easily fulfilled we are well aware. But there is no doubt that we can get rid of many social handicaps, and go on to higher adventures, discovering more and more of the goodness of God in the land of the living.

A hundred years ago people shuddered at the name 'Gaol-fever,' a terrible pestilence which attacked judge and jury, prisoner and onlooker, at the Old Bailey. We call it typhus fever now, and it is rare in Britain, thanks to the enthusiasm of the early nineteenth-century hygienists. It is a dirt disease; it can be controlled by care and cleanliness. It is due to a microbe, not yet isolated, which is transferred from man to man by infected lice. As Sir Ray Lankester says, the Angel of Death they spoke of a hundred years ago is the clothes' louse, which can be readily exterminated by the use of benzine. We cannot but feel that it was almost contemptible to have submitted for centuries to a tyranny of dirt; but the point is that we are continuing to submit to similar things. We are slow to gird up our loins; we are slow to learn the lesson of the Control of Life.

2. It has been said that there are two views of this world—that which regards it as a swamp to be crossed as quickly as possible, and that which regards it as a marsh to be drained. The view to which the study of animate nature points is

¹ J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, *The Church and her Problems*.

emphatically the latter. Man must continue the struggle against inhabitants—the campaign in which living creatures have been engaged for millions of years, the endeavour to bring the inorganic into the service of the organic, to bring the body-mind into subordination to the mind-body, to eliminate the disorderly, the inharmonious, the involutory. For we adhere to the thesis that evolution is, *on the whole*, integrative, not disintegrative.

3. To put the same thing in a third way—which is more generalized—we are in profound agreement with the view well expressed by a contemporary philosopher, that it is man's part to build up, as he is doing, a scientific systematization of knowledge which will form the basis of an increasing control of life. The mundane goal of the evolutionary movement is 'the mastery by the human mind of the conditions, internal as well as external, of its life and growth. The primitive intelligence is useful to the organism as a more elastic method of adjusting itself to its environment. As the mental powers develop the tables are turned, and the mind adjusts its environment to its own needs. "*Mihi res non me rebuss ubiungere conor*" is the motto that it takes for its own. With the mastery of external nature, applied science has made us all familiar. But the last enemy that man shall overcome is himself. The internal conditions of life, the physiological basis of mental activity, the sociological laws that operate for the most part unconsciously, are parts of the "environment" which the self-conscious intelligence has to master, and it is on this mastery that the *regnum hominis* will rest' (Hobhouse, 1915, p. 443). Of a truth science is for life, not life for science.¹

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Gospel.

'That gospel which I preach among the Gentiles.'—Gal 2².

The Apostle Paul brought with him into that Greek and Roman world which was assigned as the sphere of his apostleship a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew religion in which he had been trained, and in which, as a preparation for the religion of Christ, he would find the vital beginnings of such faith and experience as came to fulfilment in what he afterwards spoke of as 'my gospel.' By this he meant the gospel as it had

come to him, as it had taken hold of him and transformed him, and as therefore it was his special mission to make it known to the world. But, distinctive as was his type of teaching and of experience, the essential principles of the gospel were the same, by whomsoever it was proclaimed.

1. First of all, we are faced everywhere in the Bible, even in the Old Testament, with a great *Divine Initiative*, becoming effectual through the co-operating faith of man.

When Paul was at Athens, he found an altar with the inscription 'To an Unknown God.' Its origin and exact meaning he did not know. But it seemed to him a true summing up of the findings, or non-findings, of the acutest racial intellect the world has ever known, when it would master the problems of human being and of human life. There was no negation of God on the part of such a prophet soul as Socrates; of such a dreamer of dreams and seer of visions as Plato; of such an explorer of the wide universe as Aristotle. In each of these, and in many another of the great thinkers of antiquity, the spiritual instinct testified of the Divine. But, when they essayed to determine its meaning, how impotent they were! And, whether they fell back, for popular effect, on the mythology of which Paul saw such abundant evidence in Athens, or sought in their speculation to soar to the ever-receding altitudes of the Infinite Reason, their very helplessness was spelling out their halting tribute 'To an Unknown God.' Thus they were left to the athletics of their own wonderful thought, to the unaided struggles of their own life, and to the delivery of a message which came to men only with their own authority, an authority greatly impaired by the radical divergence of the great systems each from each, and paralysed in any case by the fatal lack of any proffered power that should make it possible for men to respond to the claims of the message.

There was no such lack in the great Hebrew Religion that had nurtured the apostle's earliest thought. The essential truths of that religion were indeed overlaid in his days by the meticulous puerilities of rabbinic teaching, even as they had had to contend from the beginning with what was often the coarse and crass religious symbolism of the old Semitic world; a system which had to be partially adopted, and at the same time so modified and controlled, that it might be purged of its baser

¹ J. Arthur Thomson, *The System of Animate Nature*.

parts, and made into a pictorial prophecy of better things, until such time as it might be altogether done away. But the essential truths were there, in quenchless splendour, burning their way on to the sovereign fulfilment in Christ. Of these, the supreme truth was the truth of a Living God. Such a God had come to men, had communed with them, had made His mighty impact upon their life. The I Am was no abstraction of thought, but the God who was present everywhere, and most intimately present where He was needed most; the One who, from age to age, is ever ready to be more to men than the most they can desire, supplying all their need. So said the Apostle: 'He made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he is not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being' (Ac 17²⁶⁻²⁸). That well describes the uncertain gropings of the Gentile world, which were now destined to meet their full response. But the Gentiles, in their turn, were to learn that God was in reality finding them, even as He had found Abraham long ago, and Moses: and not only every prophet soul, but every devout, inquiring spirit.

(1) The Divine Initiative is evident among the Hebrews in the Law; not the law of ceremony, nor even chiefly the Moral Law, as the law of the great Commandments, though this, in its august splendour, is of unique significance and value; but the Law as God's communication to man of such truth as bears upon human character and life. It is this of which it is said in the 1st Psalm, concerning the godly man, 'His delight is in the law of Jehovah, and on his law doth he meditate day and night.' It is a law that, far from binding him harshly, ministers to his refreshment, like streams of water to the tree whose roots they lave, thus making his life fruitful in all good. Even in its more imperative form, as finding utterance in the 'Ten Words' of Horeb, it begins, 'I am Jehovah thy God'—the God who has been to the people a God of deliverances, and whom they were thus emboldened to claim as their possession (Ex 20²). What an impulse to the keeping of the ethical precepts that follow, each of which was an expression of loyalty to their own God! Or again, when the spiritual essence of the Law of Command was gathered up into its positive and perfect form, it was this: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God

with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might' (Dt 6⁵)—a love responsive to the love of a God who gave Himself to His people, and in its turn giving inspiration to all other love (see Mt 22³⁷⁻³⁹), and impelling to ready duty and service.

(2) This same Divine Initiative is very manifest in Prophecy, which is the forthtelling of God's purposes of grace, actually by those who spoke in His name, but essentially by God Himself, who thus, so to speak, steps into the open, and becomes His own interpreter. There has never been any ethical teaching of nations—any 'Politics,' to use the Greek expression—that can compare for one moment with the ethics of Hebrew Prophecy, and certainly never any dynamic of motive comparable to the tender persuasion and promise with which the moral exhortation is urged. Nor, in the midst of all that concerns the nation, is the individual overlooked; for it is not forgotten that the individual is the living unit of the nation, and ever and again the appeal seems to be intentionally focused on the individual's need and welfare. The national and the individual messages are often fused into one, but it is never forgotten that the people of Israel was once the man Jacob. And as, by the intervention of God's exceeding mercy, Jacob became Israel, the conqueror of his baser self, so, by the same intervention of grace, may every one who belongs to the Israel community share in the same individual victory with the ancestor of his people. 'But thou, Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Thou whom I have taken hold of from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the corners thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away. Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness.' 'But now thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee. For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour' (Is 41⁸⁻¹⁰ 43¹⁻³).

(3) Again, amid all the subjective piety of the Psalms, though here it is mainly man who is speaking to God, yet man is speaking out of his experience of God, and the Divine Initiative is still very prominent. If it were a question of applied ethics, the psalmists had much to learn, as regards, for example, their feelings towards their enemies; but the essential ethic of character is most impressively set forth in their experience. God, even the Living God, had begun everything for them; God was above, and around, and beneath them in everything; God was their all in all. To verify this statement in detail would be to quote from every page. In the 8th Psalm, it is said of man, 'Thou art mindful of him; thou visitest him.' In the 16th, 'O my soul, thou hast said unto Jehovah, Thou art my Lord: I have no good beyond thee.' In the 27th, 'The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?' In the 34th, 'They looked unto him, and were radiant; and their faces shall never be confounded.' In the 36th, 'For with thee is the fountain of life: in thy light shall we see light.' In the 40th, 'I waited patiently for the Lord; and he inclined unto me, and heard my cry. He brought me up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay; and he set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings.' And in the 63rd we have the great central experience of the Bible, 'O God, thou art my God.' To pass over instances innumerable which show that the Divine intervention, the Divine Initiative, was ever present to the mind of the psalmists, and was felt by them to be the spring of all their good, the guarantee of their strength, and the inspiration of their life, we may close this survey with a glance at the 139th Psalm, in which these things are set forth at length: 'O Lord, thou hast searched me, and known me. Thou dost enfold me behind and before, and lay thy hand upon me. Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? Thy hand shall grasp me, and thy right hand shall hold me fast. How precious are thy thoughts unto me, O God! When I awake, I am still with thee.'

This preliminary survey of the ethical bearings of the Old Testament, in its great commanding principles, has not only shown the power of a great Divine Initiative, as present alike in the Law, in Prophecy, and in the Piety of the Hebrew

Religion; it has also brought before our notice other factors in the religious experience of the Hebrew people. But all through, it will have been observed that there is no ambiguity nor uncertainty as to the Chief Good. This is nothing other than God Himself, the Living God, coming into man's very possession, living with man in the communion of love, through faith, and becoming continually a yet surer possession through the service of love. 'My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God. Hope thou in God; for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God' (Pss 42. 43). Such is the cry of the heart for God; such is the answer to the cry.

2. Mingled with the gracious utterances that reveal a Divine Presence and Power at work in the world, especially in the history of Israel, is the insistence upon a great *Divine Redemption*.

This is made very impressive in such words of Prophecy as those already quoted. They need not be repeated, nor need others be brought forward to supplement their assurance. But the whole history of the Hebrews was a history of redemption. Their forefather Abraham was redeemed from Babylonian idolatry, and all its attendant evil; their father Jacob was redeemed from the 'Jacob' nature to the 'Israel' character; the people of Israel were redeemed from Egyptian bondage and degradation; they were redeemed from the wilderness wanderings and apostasies; they were redeemed at last from Babylonian captivity.

Along with this strange history of redemption, there was the equally strange symbolism of redemption in their ceremonial and sacrificial law—strange to us, but to be explained as God's allowance and adoption, for the purpose of what we may call 'kindergarten' teaching, of a system so thoroughly saturating that old Semitic world with its ideas and principles, that, humanly speaking, the only way of disentangling the Hebrews from its perilous materialism was by regulating its operation, gradually disparaging its sensuous, almost sensual, 'rudiments' (Gal 4⁸), by the searching message of the prophets and the piety of the psalmists, until at last, after 'being done away' for the enlightened, even while still running its course, it was altogether 'done away in Christ' (2 Co 3^{18. 14}). But the great idea, that was wrought into all that complex of human custom by the controlling

power of God, was the idea, and ideal, of Divine Redemptive Sacrifice.

3. We have again anticipated another factor in that old religious life of Israel, concurrent with the teaching of a Divine Redemption. There was a great *Divine Assurance*.

Most tenderly, and with infinite persuasion, does God assure His people, by the prophetic word, 'I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake; and I will not remember thy sins.' 'O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me. I have blotted out, as a thick mist, thy transgressions, and, as a black cloud, thy sins. Return unto me, for I have redeemed thee.' 'For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall my covenant of peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee' (Is 43²⁵ 44^{21, 22} 54¹⁰).

4. This leads us to yet another factor, closely connected with the former. God was seeking to lead His people to the anointing of a great *Divine Consecration*.

Not only the specific covenant made with the people at Horeb, as represented in Deuteronomy, so searchingly rehearsed in Josiah's time that it

led to an amazing reformation; but the whole character of Jehovah's agreement, or covenant, with His people in the old dispensation, was one prolonged re-utterance of the claim, 'Ye shall be holy, for I am holy.' God was pledged to them; they must pledge themselves to God. Hundreds of times we are confronted with the words 'holy' and 'holiness,' in the Hebrew Scriptures. The persuasion of the promises was at once the release from all bondage of fear, and a constraint to joyful service. The Law was a law of holiness; the words of the Prophets were a call to holiness; the piety of the Psalms shines with the 'beauty of holiness'; the Wisdom teaching sought to consecrate common life with holiness.

Such, then, is the Ethic of the Hebrew Religion—a revelation of grace, and of anticipated redemption, pressed home upon the hearts of the people, and finding its outcome in the praise of God and the service of man. The very commandments of Sinai, thus inspired, and transfigured by the prophetic teaching, become a law of liberty, anticipating the Sermon on the Mount, and preparing for One in whose life Holy Love was made perfect.¹

¹ T. F. Lockyer, *Paul: Luther: Wesley*.

'The Man Borne of Four.'

A STUDY IN SPIRITUAL HEALING.

BY THE REVEREND R. H. STRACHAN, D.D., EDINBURGH.

It is even more remarkable than it seems that our Lord says to the paralytic, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.' The utterance is remarkable, because the man and his friends had come seeking healing for his body, not for his soul. It is far too easy an interpretation to say that no doubt this man was the victim of sensual indulgence, and that he reaped what he had sown. This is to narrow down the significance of the story far too much. The significant point is that Jesus assumes that a case of severe 'paralysis'—a very general medical term; for there can have been no proper classification of disease—requires for its cure an assurance of the forgiveness of sins. We know now that not only does actual sensual indulgence produce evil physical effects; we know that not merely a wrong

thing done by a man, but a wrong done to a man, may so *unconsciously* rankle in the abysmal deep we call the soul as to produce actual symptoms of severe physical malady. We are prone to assume that 'forgiveness' belongs to another region of things, to a 'world' separate from the 'world' to which bodily ailments belong. We set the two worlds, 'spiritual' and 'natural,' too sharply over against each other; we separate 'soul' and 'body.' To-day medical science is recalling us to another view.

It is well that, in dealing with this particular story, we should avoid an unnecessarily wide extension of the problem, and any general consideration of the question of miracles. Neither is it necessary to assume that all our Lord's miracles

are on the same psychological plane. Miracle has a much wider connotation than is usually given to it. Prayer involves miracle; conversion is a miracle; the achievements of Christian love, and patience, and sympathy equally involve the supernatural. There is a miracle behind and beneath all Jesus' miracles, the wonder of a compassionate insight which descends swiftly, at a glance, to the hidden sources of each sufferer's particular need, and is able to satisfy it. This man has up till now been treated by his friends, and has regarded himself, merely as a paralytic. His physical condition has occupied all their attention and his. Jesus alone knows that the root of the trouble is spiritual, and He treats it accordingly.

I am not attempting to enter at all fully or adequately into the question of spiritual healing. It is, however, an immense relief to know that this whole question is being rapidly taken out of the hands of the ignorant and the charlatan, and is being dealt with by trained scientific minds. Very many of these do not claim that 'spiritual healing' is a substitute for religion. I think I am right in saying that the most successful psycho-therapists are themselves men and women who recognize the supreme value of the religious motive in their work, whether their religion is expressed in orthodox form or not. True spiritual healing is no substitute for religion. Rather is it 'a new weapon added to the religious armoury.'

1. In this story we have a warrant, in the teaching of Jesus, for regarding certain sicknesses of the body as due to sickness of the soul. This is not true because Jesus says so; Jesus says it, and acts upon it, because it is true. Therefore a name like 'Christian Science' is a misnomer. Science is neither Christian nor un-Christian. It is either true or false.

The outstanding fact in this story is that Jesus recognized swiftly that this man's physical need could only be met by the satisfaction of a deeper need than he himself or his friends were conscious of. There was a sickness of the soul. How that soul-sickness had come about we do not know. He had evidently done some wrong. What the wrong thing was we do not know. The disease need not have been the fruit of sensual indulgence. He may at the moment have had no conscious recollection of any wrong thing. What wrong he had done he may have buried in the past; he had forgotten it.

Buried in the past? The popular notion of the past is that it is a region out of which we have moved; with which we need not necessarily have anything more to do. This man, like many another, did not know that in God's universe there are no rubbish-heaps where our wrong-doings can be shot. They remain lying in the hidden abysmal depths of our own personality. We carry these forgotten experiences of the past about with us. The teaching of modern science is that they are not dead and done with; that the output of mental energy required to persuade ourselves that they are—often unconsciously exercised—is itself a serious drain on the general energy needed for spiritual and physical control. These so-called 'forgotten' things are septic centres in our spiritual life and outlook. We do not know why we are cynical, jealous, irritable, or depressed. Often, also, these unconscious influences produce evil physical effects, nervous prostration, paralysis of physical power.

We must, however, guard ourselves against the assertion that all disease is the fruit of personal wrong-doing; or that all disease, including organic, will yield to spiritual treatment. That certain mental conditions can ultimately induce certain forms of organic disease is certain. It is not the same thing to say that organic disease so induced can be cured by dealing with the mental condition. What can be definitely asserted is that in all healing, spiritual and religious influences must now have a place. Jesus is again given, in all healing, the supreme place. His Spirit is the ultimate source of all medical science.

The man in our story lay on his pallet, helpless and dependent upon his friends. His whole shattered nervous system had to stand the strain of the lifting, and pulling, and lowering needed to lay him at the feet of Jesus. One wonders whether, for such a case as his, these unwonted movements were merely torture, or whether they provided a stimulus to the nervous system not unfavourable to the cure. However that may be, his friends apparently had the determination, and the faith. Jesus saw 'their faith,' not his; for apparently he had none. Instead, He looked down with an irresistible divine intuition into the forgotten depths of the man's soul, and from that depth the man looked up. And Jesus said, 'Be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee.'

Lord, from the depth to thee I cry'd;
My voice, Lord, do thou hear.

Jesus' words were themselves a quickening of memory. He knew now whence all that disorder and depression of soul had come which for long he had attributed to growing weakness of body. He knew the meaning of that bitterness of rebellion which physical suffering had brought, and which itself had produced this physical collapse. Jesus reverses the order of all his thoughts. He was ill and weak, he thought, therefore God had forsaken him. Really the conviction that God was against him, and had either permitted or imposed his suffering, was the cause of his illness, 'Son, thy sins are forgiven thee.'

2. What shall we say of the answer of Jesus to the hostility of the Pharisees present? Apparently their chief preoccupation was not with the question of a possible healing miracle, but with the claim that was involved in Jesus' words: 'Who can forgive sins but God alone?'

It is important to note the significance of Jesus' answer. Very often, in interpretations of this story, commentators have seen in the healing miracle that follows only an illustration and a proof, before the eyes of His opponents, that His claim to forgive sins is really a valid one. 'That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins' (He said to the sick of the palsy), 'I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk.' It is usually assumed that here are described two separate divine acts, in answer to two separate needs which the man had: one, the need of forgiveness, the other—the need of which he was conscious—of bodily healing. We may, however, ask ourselves again, why Jesus, in His defence, lays such emphasis on the word 'say.' 'Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise . . . walk?' The meaning can only be that the former utterance appears to His opponents to be a mere empty claim. The words sounded not only blasphemous, but futile. They said in effect, 'No assurance of God's favour to this man can have any result at all.' In their own minds, following the lines of the conventional thinking on such matters, they traced the man's physical condition to a judicial act of God. There was no psychological connexion for them between the sense of God's disfavour and the physical condition. God had simply shown His antipathy to a sinner by thus afflicting him. The connexion

between sin and suffering was to them an arbitrary connexion, founded on the sheer will of God.

In answer to this, Jesus seeks to convince them that the promise of forgiveness is no mere utterance that wastes itself in air, but that the words are actually followed by a physical result, which could not have taken place unless their full meaning had been realized in the man's own consciousness. He is seeking to do much more than give a palpable illustration, represented in the bodily healing, of the effect of His words. He does not seem to mean, 'A result follows clearly in one case; surely then in the other.' Rather He means that the cure *is* the actual result of an acceptance of forgiveness on the man's part. Jesus here forges no new link between sin and suffering. He does forge a link between suffering and a mood of alienation from God, perhaps of inward bitterness and rebellion—the mood of a man who knew no better way of ridding himself of a wrong done by him, or to him, than to forget it; or of a moral struggle within himself than to repress it. Perhaps the alleged absence of 'a sense of sin' to-day in the average man is largely the result of an ignorance which knows not where to go when it sins or is sinned against.

The paralytic man was conscious that nature was against him. We are all familiar with the way in which such a thought would be expressed to-day. Nature is a blind unconscious force, mechanical in its operation. There is a fate in human action, a fate in human character. The world to-day is full of men and women who have made up their minds that moral advance is either impossible, or that it proceeds at such a slow pace as practically to be negligible. Forgiveness, as things are, is a delusion. Nature, men say, never forgives, and Divine forgiveness is largely taken for granted, if thought of at all. '*C'est son métier,*' as Heine said. There is often—even in the utterances of the bravest souls who have lost religious faith, and glorify the courage displayed in facing life's shocks and menaces—a certain defiance which is far removed from that victorious 'Peace be unto you' which was our Lord's legacy to men.

In the fell clutch of circumstance
I have not winced, nor cried aloud:
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody but unbowed.

While we must recognize the nobility of such a mood, Henley's whole poem, so characteristic of the human ideal of to-day, quivers with the nervous energy of one who seeks to forget pain by an act of will. It is a series of 'complexes' woven into the form of lyric poetry.

It is hardly fanciful to say that the mood of some of those sufferers who were brought to Jesus represented the failure of that very attitude to-day towards pain, evil, and death—an attitude of brave defiance—which seems to have some doubtful successes among the poets and philosophers of our day. For the moment, the menace to be met and conquered seems to be mainly that of pain and suffering. Most of us will agree with R. L. Stevenson in his criticism of a spurious kind of 'resignation,' which he describes as 'the cowardice that apes a kind of courage, and that lives in the very breath of health-resorts.' 'The man can open the door . . . he can be a kind of man after all, and not merely an invalid.' Most of us will, I think, agree that unless this heroism is to be captured and dominated by a religious faith which makes it certain that pain and death have not really the final word in the contest, serious reaction through failure is bound to come. The religious motive must pervade the modern tireless struggle against pain and disease. Spiritual healing to-day is a cheering signal that the mechanism of natural law is only a subordinate element in a wider spiritual world. 'That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, I say unto thee, Arise.'

Forgiveness of sins means that God is our Friend, and stronger than all that makes us afraid. This assurance that God is our Friend, ever and continually, has certain definite results in human life. The longing for it is also a sign of returning health, and not of recurrent soul-sickness. Our message of forgiveness is not futile. The most deadly kind of opposition to the Christian faith is the idea that it can be ignored. It has unique results in human character, in society; even in our own bodily health. Whatever the results in health are or can be, it is not for us to set limits

to the power of God over disease, as some are disposed to do in arguing about spiritual healing. Even where suffering still remains or death enters, we are encouraged to believe that our Father's love can ensure that these will work out His precious purposes. The Christian is not dismayed by unanswered prayer. We must ever say, 'If it be thy will': but never with the suspicion or the fear that 'He will not.' Dr. John Brown once said, after hearing Dr. Candlish preach on prayer at St. George's: 'It was splendid; he first made you feel that you could ask for anything, a five-pound note, and then he dared you to have any overmastering wish, but, "Thy will be done."' It is just this assurance that we are here and now, in trials and difficulties and sufferings—in a Father's house—and children of God—that we need to-day. It is only in a home that children are in the habit of asking for anything; it is only in a home that they learn the meaning of refusals. Jesus opens the door of the Father's home and the Father's heart when He says, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.' Through Him we have the freedom of the universe. *Quis separabit?*

3. There is a surprising absence of any conditions in Jesus' offer of forgiveness. There is no encouragement given to the question that arises in our minds, 'Was it not only by His death that Jesus brought forgiveness to men?' Jesus did not in His Cross make forgiveness possible: He made it credible. Both natural law—the natural environment of His day—and the sin of men conspired to slay His love: and Love triumphed over both. At what cost, the Cross shows; but 'it was not for Jesus to magnify the cost; rather to magnify the freedom of the gift.' God forgives, the Father forgives. No mist of quiet, or shame, or fear, or doubt can dim for us that one radiant truth for which Jesus stood. No disabling sense of law can destroy our freedom. That accepted by the imprisoned soul is simply all that He stood for or cared to stand for. Without Jesus, forgiveness on this scale is incredible. 'No man cometh unto the Father, but by me.'

Entre Nous.

THE MOST IMPRESSIVE TEXT.

'THE splendid personality of Silas Wright has been best revealed to us in Irving Bacheller's *The Light in the Clearing*. The book is partly history and partly commentary and partly fiction. Silas Wright, says Irving Bacheller, carried the candle of the Lord; and all the world rejoiced in its radiance.

'Barton Baynes, the hero of the book—for whose actuality and historicity the author vouches—is an orphan brought up on a farm by his Uncle Peabody and Aunt Deel. Getting into all sorts of scrapes, he makes up his mind that he is too heavy a burden on the affectionate and good-natured couple; and one night he runs away. Out in the darkness, however, he meets with strange adventures, loses his way, and at length finds himself in the hands of Silas Wright, the Comptroller. The Senator first falls in love with the bright-faced, open-hearted, intelligent boy, and then takes him back to his uncle's farm. From that moment the friendship between the two—the great man and the obscure country boy—grows apace. After a while the Senator visits the district to deliver an address, and he spends the night at the farmhouse. It is a great occasion for Bart; and after supper an incident occurs that colours all his life and strikes the keynote of the book. As Barton approaches Mr. Wright to say Good-night, the Senator says:

"I shall be gone when you are up in the morning. It may be a long time before I see you; I shall leave something for you in a sealed envelope with your name on it. You are not to open the envelope until you go away to school. I know how you will feel that first day. When night falls, you will think of your aunt and uncle and be very lonely. When you go to your room for the night I want you to sit down all by yourself and read what I shall write. They will be, I think, the most impressive words ever written. You will think them over, but you will not understand them for a long time. Ask every wise man you meet to explain them to you, for all your happiness will depend upon your understanding of those few words in the envelope."

'The words in the sealed envelope!

'What are the mysterious words in the envelope?

'And what if the sealed envelope contains a text?

'In the morning, when Barton rose, the Senator was gone, and Aunt Deel handed the boy the sealed envelope. It was addressed: "Master Barton Baynes; to be opened when he leaves home to go to school." That day soon came. At the Canton Academy, under the care of the excellent Michael Hacket, Bart felt terribly lonely, and, in accordance with the Senator's instructions, he opened the note. And this is what he read:

"DEAR BART,—I want you to ask the wisest man you know to explain these words to you. I suggest that you commit them to memory and think often of their meaning. They are from Job: '*His bones are full of the sin of his youth, which shall lie down with him in the dust.*' I believe that they are the most impressive in all the literature I have read.—SILAS WRIGHT."¹

PERSONAL.

Carlyle.

The things of most interest in Dean Inge's Rede Lecture for 1922 on *The Victorian Age* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 2s. 6d. net) are his swift characterizations of certain of the persons who made that age great. The greatest of them all, he thinks, was Tennyson. His words are: 'The grandest and most fully representative figure in all Victorian literature is of course Alfred Tennyson.' After which follows an unexpectedly enthusiastic appreciation. Who were the rest? He names Darwin, Gladstone, Manning, Newman, Martineau, Lord Lawrence, and Burne-Jones. This is what he says of Carlyle:

'Carlyle was a Stoic, or in other words a Calvinist without dogmas; he had also learned to be a mystic from his studies of German idealism. He represents one phase of the anti-French reaction; he hated most of the ideas of 1789, as displayed in their results. He hated the scepticism of the Revolution, its negations, its love of clap-trap rhetoric and fine phrases, and above all its anarchism. He wished to see society well ordered, under its wisest men; he wished to overcome

¹ F. W. Boreham, *A Handful of Stars*, 170.

materialism by idealism, and loose morality by industry and the fear of God. Justice, he declared, is done in this world; right is might, if we take long views. Institutions collapse when they become shams, and no longer fulfil their function. The sporting squires ought to be founding colonies instead of preserving game. As for the new industrialism, he disliked it with the fervour of a Scottish peasant.'

Madame Montessori.

In the welter of theories and the deeper welter of practices of Education at the present time, a guide so competent and condensed as Mr. H. M. Beatty's *A Brief History of Education* (Watts; 4s. 6d. net) is most welcome. The book has the right to be called a History, for it covers the whole ground. But half of it is wisely reserved for Pestalozzi and those who came after him. Herbart is much praised. Montessori is not approved of. 'Dr. Montessori, however, is more than a teacher; she claims to be an educational thinker, and has expounded her views in several large volumes. It is therefore necessary to consider her principles; especially as it is claimed that they are applicable to education generally and not merely to the work of the "children's homes." On these principles, or rather principle, Dr. Montessori is emphatic: "The fundamental principle of scientific pedagogy must be, indeed, the *liberty of the pupil*" (the italics are hers); and again, "'social liberty' signifies a partial liberation, the liberation of a country, of a class, or of thought. That concept of liberty which must inspire pedagogy is, instead, universal."

'With reference to this universal liberty, one feature is worthy of observation—that the instrument for carrying it into effect is the "didactic apparatus," which is standardized, fixed, and even patented. As has been well said: "For the vibrating, living voice of the teacher is substituted the cold and toneless voice of the material, through which there speaks to the child Dr. Montessori herself—not as an educator ever renewing and perfecting herself, but in a form realized once for all and rigid." In fact, this concept of universal liberty is a flight of Dr. Montessori's characteristic rhetoric. Her words can mean nothing less than anarchy, and no system of education can co-exist with anarchy. But she has no other principle; and indeed she condemns her predecessors,

Pestalozzi, Rousseau, and Herbart, because they based their education on "philosophic and abstract principles." Her own system, on the contrary, is merely a collection of miscellaneous expedients; her system of thought is purely sensational.'

Dr. Hutton and Dr. Jowett.

While Dr. Joseph Fort Newton was minister of the City Temple he kept a diary. He has now published it, with additions and emendations. *Preaching in London* is the title (Doran; \$1.50). It is mixed reading. What could be more generous than this appreciation of Dr. Hutton?—

'Dr. John Hutton, of Glasgow, preached in the City Temple to-day, his theme being—"The Temptation," that is, the one temptation that includes all others—the spirit of cynicism that haunts all high moods. Artfully, subtly it seeks to lower, somehow, the lights of the soul, to slay ideals, to betray and deliver us to basemindedness. Such preaching! He searches like a surgeon and heals like a physician. Seldom, if ever, have I had anyone walk right into my heart with a lighted candle in his hand, as he did, and look into the dark corners. For years I had known him as a master of the inner life, whether dealing with the Bible "At Close Quarters," or with those friends and aiders of faith, like Browning; and there are passages in "The Winds of God" that echo like great music. As a guide to those who are walking in the middle years of life, where bafflements of faith are many and moral pitfalls are deep, there is no one like Hutton; no one near him. But, rich as his books are, his preaching is more wonderful than his writing. While his sermon has the finish of a literary essay, it is delivered with the enthusiasm of an evangelist. The whole man goes into it, uniting humour, pathos, unction, with a certain wildness of abandon, as of one possessed, which is the note of truly great preaching. In my humble judgment he is the greatest preacher in Britain.'

And what could be more astonishing than this depreciation of Dr. Jowett which follows a few pages after?—

'Dr. Jowett began his ministry at Westminster Chapel to-day,—the anniversary of Pentecost,—welcomed by a hideous air-raid. Somehow, while Dr. Jowett always kindles my imagination, he never gives me that sense of reality which is the greatest thing in preaching. One enjoys his musi-

cal voice, his exquisite elocution, his mastery of the art of illustration, and his fastidious style; but the substance of his sermons is incredibly thin. Of course, this is due, in large part, to the theory of popular preaching on which he works. His method is to take a single idea—large or small—and turn it over and over, like a gem, revealing all its facets, on the ground that one idea is all that the average audience is equal to. Of this method Dr. Jowett is a consummate master, and it is a joy to see him make use of it, though at times it leads to a tedious repetition of the text. Often, too, he seems to be labouring under the handicap of a brilliant novelist, who must needs make up in scenery what is lacking in plot.

‘Since his return to London he has been less given to filigree rhetoric, and he has struck almost for the first time a social note, to the extent, at any rate, of touching upon public affairs—although no one would claim that Dr. Jowett has a social message, in the real meaning of that phrase. No, his forte is personal religious experience of a mild evangelical type; and to a convinced Christian audience of that tradition and training he has a ministry of edification and comfort. But for the typical man of modern mind, caught in the currents and alive to the agitations of our day, Dr. Jowett has no message. However, we must not expect everything from any one servant of God, and the painter is needed as well as the prophet.’

SOME TOPICS.

Ideals.

‘I was speaking to an assembly in New York immediately after the war. I referred to the ideals which had sustained us in the conflict and the opportunities, now presented, to realize them. I was followed by a prominent statesman and publicist. He said in effect, “The moral ideals of the war were all right in their time and place. They served to sustain the hopes, energies and endurance of the common masses throughout the struggle. They enabled us to win the victory. But now the victory is won, let us forget as soon as possible those iridescent dreams and turn to practical affairs.” And he indicated that he meant by “practical affairs” merely business prosperity and commercial aggrandizement; and his audience, a trade association, applauded him to the echo, rising to their feet in their enthusiasm. I felt as if the voice of our heroic dead would speak in such

withering rebuke as Alfred Noyes has since expressed in his noble lines:

“Now in this morning of a nobler age
Though night-born eyes, long taught to fear
the sun,
Would still delay the world’s great heritage,
Make firm, O God, the peace our dead have
won.
For Folly shakes the tinsel on her head,
And points us backward to darkness and to
hell,
Cackling, ‘Beware of visions,’ while our dead
Still cry, ‘It was for visions that we fell.’”

‘In this slump from high idealism into sneering cynicism and sodden, sordid materialism, we are threatened with a régime of reaction with its characteristic obscurantism and repression, if such a régime is not already upon us.’

So says Bishop Charles D. Williams.

The passage is found in his Lyman Beecher Lectures (better known as the Yale Lectures on Preaching) for 1920, which he has published under the title of *The Prophetic Ministry for Today* (Macmillan; \$1.50).

Bishop Williams recommends and uses good modern illustrations. This is one: ‘I crossed the Atlantic recently on a steamer that carried the most powerful wireless apparatus in use. The air was laden with messages from out the unseen. But most of the ships heard but partially. To receive them—all required two things, the finest and most powerful instruments possible, and those instruments constantly attuned to the wave length of the sending instrument. God is ever speaking to men. His messages abound everywhere. All hear Him more or less in the voice of conscience. But if you would be a prophet, an interpreter of the fuller and finer messages of God to your fellows, you must offer Him the finest and fullest spiritual personality you can achieve, and then keep that personality constantly attuned to the mind of God.’

Christianity and Machinery.

‘Just in the same way that machine production has created an atmosphere inimical to the arts, it has created an atmosphere antipathic to religion. The really practical challenge to Christian morals does not come from the materialist philosophy but from the machine. The old rationalists denied

the supernatural character of Christianity, but they did not challenge its moral code. That challenge, it is to be observed, came from those whose ultimate belief was in the beneficence of machinery, who in some vague way imagined that machinery had rendered Christianity obsolete much in the same way that it was rendering the handicraft obsolete. Foremost among those who so believed was Marx, for the new morality that he postulates is something that is to arise as a consequence of the dissolution of the fabric of existing society by the machine, and remembering how the factory system tends to break up family life there is no doubt a connection between the two. Such an antagonism is felt by men who have lived under happier conditions in the East. Let me quote the words of a Hindoo, Rab Bharati, on this question. He says :

“What is this civilization anyway? I have lived in four of its chief centres for about five years. During that time I have studied this civilization with the little light with which my Brahmin birth has blessed me. And I must confess that I have been deeply pained by the facts that study has revealed to me. This vaunted civilization has raised selfishness to a religious creed. Mammon to the throne of God, adulteration to a science, falsehood to a fine art. . . . It has created artificial wants for man, and made him a slave of work to satisfy them; it has made him ever restless within and without, robbed him of leisure—the only friend of high thought. He knows no peace, hence he knows not himself nor his real object in life. It has made him a breathing, moving, hustling, fighting, spinning machine—ever working, never resting, never knowing even the refreshing rest of a sound sleep. It has made him a bag of live nerves ever stretched to high tension. It has sapped the foundation of home life, and, its trunk separated from its roots, its roof-tree threatens to fall, shaken by each passing breeze. Its vulgar haste and love of sensation are invading even the realm of religion, which is being classed with fads and crazes. Its boasted scientific inventions have done more harm than good to humanity's best and permanent interests; they serve only the surface of life which alone its votaries live and know.”¹

‘Science’ and ‘Religion.’

In his book on *The Individual and the Community* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net), Mr. R. E.

¹ A. J. Penty, *Post-Industrialism*, 48.

Roper, M.A., M.Ed., argues for the free play of Evolution in all the parts of man and in all the associations of men. Repression, the unsympathetic exercise of authority, that is the evil. In his chapter on Education he even blames Madame Montessori. ‘Even Mme Montessori has this phrase on discipline: “I had to intervene to show with what absolute rigour it is necessary to hinder, and little by little suppress, all those things which we must not do, so that the child may come to discern clearly between good and evil.” To use the terms of the later psychologists, one does not suppress since one wishes to avoid repression: it is necessary to “sublimate.”’

He insists on the recognition of all the facts. Scientists are inclined to ignore God. That, he says, is unscientific. ‘The evolution of the physical nature of man goes hand in hand with the evolution of his idea of God. There is something wilfully blind about that so-called scientific mentality which in the past refused to consider the influence of religion upon human development. The air we breathe, the food we eat, the fuel we consume, these apparently are legitimate subjects of enquiry: but the faith of man apparently is to be dismissed as a childish boggy, too vague for serious thought. Yet, whether man makes his God as he progresses, or—as he progresses—becomes more capable of comprehension, whether the soul be a later evolution of perfected thought or the original cause of evolution, the fact that every race of man at apparently every stage of evolution has “believed in God” and had some concept, however vague, of man's immortal part, is evidence enough to be weighed by the common sense of men and women against the cold analyses of all the professors in the world. For, in considering human co-existence, belief—however “superstitious”—will be found to play at least as large a part in policy and the decision of action as economic need. The science of co-existence has as its subject-matter the activities of mankind: and in so far as human beings believe in the existence of the soul, the soul becomes to that extent concrete and as important as any gas or crystal. And should the patient and somewhat unimaginative scientist decide that the forces which first informed life have much in common with the vibrations of light and air, the men and women whom they teach may see in light but one more manifestation of God, and in the air which they

inspire a symbol of the Spirit. The student of sociology and civics must then include the human belief in God in his enquiry: for, though gropingly and in a glass darkly, it is in accordance with their idea of God that—even to-day—the great majority of men and women and children strive to order the activities of both the individual and the community.'

Patriotism and Brotherhood.

Says Mr. Sturt:

'I do not believe that, as a motive of conduct, patriotism can be replaced by any sentiment of human brotherhood. What human brotherhood may mean exactly I do not know. If it means only a faint kindly feeling towards men as such, and a dislike to see or hear about their sufferings, I admit that it is a real motive in the minds of civilized people, though a weak one. If it is meant in the literal meaning of the words, it is a piece of sentimental cant, always false and often mischievous. Does anyone really mean to argue that we ought to extend family affection to all our fellow-citizens outside the family circle? Genuine family affection is a very exclusive thing; it demands that those who feel it should be closely *en rapport* with each other, and should be very sensitive to each other's thoughts and feelings. Now it is not possible to be on such terms with more than a few people at once; and, if a man tries to exceed the natural limit of human powers, he is in danger of making a painful failure. Those who try to have too many brothers are likely to have no brothers at all; and perhaps not even many friends.'¹

Has Mr. Sturt left out Christ?

NEW POETRY.

Punch.

A volume of *Poems from Punch* has been published (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). It is not the first volume. The readers of the previous volume will be the earliest readers of this. It contains the best of the poems contributed to *Punch* from 1909 to 1920. Mr. W. B. Drayton Henderson writes an introductory essay.

Poems contributed to *Punch* have a character. Their writers understand. There is almost a trick in the writing. You can distinguish Sir Owen

¹ H. Sturt, *Socialism and Character*, 144.

Seaman from Mr. P. R. Chalmers and Mr. E. G. V. Knox from Mr. C. Hilton Brown; but you can also distinguish all these from the poets who write for the *Spectator*. Once and again there appears a serious poem, and then there is no poet who reaches a loftier height—say, Sir Owen Seaman on General Booth or Colonel McCrae on Flanders Fields.

But what to quote? Let us cast care aside and quote a children's poem. It is by a woman and it is delightful. The author is Miss Rose Fyleman, the title

SOMETIMES.

Some days are fairy days. The minute that you wake
You have a magic feeling that you never could mistake;
You may not see the fairies, but you know they're all about,
And any single minute they might all come popping out;
You want to laugh, you want to sing, you want to dance and run,
Everything is different, everything is fun;
The sky is full of fairy clouds, the streets are fairy ways—
Anything might happen on truly fairy days.

Some nights are fairy nights. Before you go to bed
You hear their darling music go chiming in your head;
You look into the garden and through the misty grey
You see the trees all waiting in a breathless kind of way.
All the stars are smiling; they know that very soon
The fairies will come singing from the land behind the moon.
If only you could keep awake when Nurse puts out the light . . .
Anything might happen on a truly fairy night.

James Laver.

Mr. James Laver is one of the known and acknowledged poets of the winter of our discontent. *His Last Sebastian* is quite sufficient proof of it (Simpkin). The poem which gives the volume its title and which comes first, is after the manner of Robert Browning, evidently

and not unworthily. But there is originality in the treatment of the subject, which is that of the artist with feet of clay. 'The Perfect Knight' is at least characteristic:

WAS IT WORTH IT, THEN?

Was it worth it, then, to reject
Love, too soon suspect?
Was it worth it, to scale the peak,
Where never a voice could speak
And say—'I love you,' so
As yours did, long ago?

Is it worth the triumph of will,
To deny that I love you still?
Or pretend to find, in the waste,
A more ennobling taste
Of the stuff of which life is made?
No, but I am afraid!

Afraid of the blackness of night,
Afraid of the huddled sight
Of all who have died by the way—
He who was yesterday
A man, and is now but a ghost;
Afraid of myself the most.

Afraid of the demon within,
Of virtue as well as of sin;
Of my god, also, afraid,
Who dwells in the body, made
Half of dust and of fire,
With a thrice-entangled desire.

So I must ever go,
Far from the cheerful glow
Of the cottage fire below,
On through the deepening snow;
Lost, and I cannot forget,
Love might have saved me yet!

Contributions and Comments.

1 Corinthians iv. 6

(EXEGESIS OR EMENDATION?).

THIS notorious *crux interpretum* has claimed the attention of all the commentators, but it is curious that all the British editors of this Epistle attempt to find a meaning in the words as they stand, and only a very few German and Dutch scholars definitely attempt a solution by a feasible emendation of the text.

The verse reads:

ταῦτα δέ, ἀδελφοί, μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἐμάντων καὶ Ἀπολλῶν δι' ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου.

We are now concerned with the exposition of μετεσχημάτισα, but with the very difficult phrase τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται.

Let us first consider the words as an integral part of the text, and their possible meaning. The article τό then makes the four following words a noun clause governed by μάθητε.

Edwards quotes Cranmer's 'beyond that whyche is above wrytten,' and shows that this would require ἐγράφη or προέγραψα, as in Eph 3³. Hofmann's 'above what has been assigned to each by God' is similarly ruled out as requiring μεμέρισται

or τέτακται, whilst ὃ would be needed rather than ἃ. [ὃ is read by DG *ω et al.*]

There is pretty general agreement that the reference is to Scripture, but whilst Lightfoot thinks of such passages as those already quoted by Paul in 1¹⁹. 31 3¹⁹. 20, Edwards and Findlay find no such specific allusion, but refer it to the general spirit and point of view of the Old Testament. The article, as Plummer observes, is equivalent to our inverted commas, and the elliptical form, as in *ne sutor ultra crepidam* (Plummer) or μηδὲν ἄγαν (Findlay), suggests a proverb (Lightfoot), or a Rabbinical adage (Ewald).

St John Parry (*C.G.T.*) makes a new contribution. He criticizes the usual view, which refers the words to the O.T. Scriptures according to Paul's regular use of γέγραπται, because of (a) the vagueness of reference, and the absence of all indication as to what Scripture teaching is meant; and (b) the lack of any appeal to Scripture in the preceding discussion about the position and duties of teachers, so that Paul and Apollos can hardly be said to have been shown as examples of this lesson. Dr. Parry goes on to suggest that γέγραπται is used here in a technical, but not the usual technical, sense. With the help of Milligan and Moulton's *Vocabulary*, he shows that γράφειν had a

current use for framing a law or contract, and that καθ' ἃ γέγραπται is commonly used in referring to an agreement and its terms. Hence Paul means here 'not to go beyond the terms,' *i.e.* of the commission as teacher.

Lietzmann (*Handbuch zum N.T.*) quotes Heinrich's suggestion that a charge of unscriptural teaching had been flung at Paul, and that he is here neatly turning their own catchword against his opponents. Lietzmann seems to favour this interpretation, but adds the cautious reminder, 'We cannot fully understand the passage just because we have before us a private letter of the most intimate kind.'

Peake (who has himself expounded 1 Co. in his One-Volume Commentary) says: 'Apparently the point is "that you might learn not to transgress the injunction of Scripture."' But he observes that the second part of v.⁶ is very difficult, the Greek elliptical and the meaning obscure. He first, among English commentators, says, 'the text is probably corrupt.' Moffatt has a footnote in his translation: 'The text and the meaning of the phrase between μάθητε and ἵνα μὴ are beyond recovery.' Plummer in a textual note in small type remarks that some editors propose to omit τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται as a marg. gloss. 'The sense is intelligible without these words, but a gloss would have taken some other form.' This last remark is, no doubt, true if we think of an *interpretative* gloss. But are we restricted to that alternative? May it not be a *textual* gloss?

Here, as so often, we find far the fullest treatment of the whole difficulty in Johannes Weiss's incomparable commentary. After discussing all the points that have arisen in earlier expositions, he comes to the conclusion that the text as transmitted to us is unintelligible. He then shows other objections:

(a) There is a suspicious repetition in τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ and ἵνα μὴ . . . ὑπὲρ.

(b) The Latin texts do not translate the ἵνα μὴ.

(c) The difficulty lying in the juxtaposition of the double object to μάθητε.

(d) The striking absence of μὴ in DE.

Now conjectural emendation is the last resort of the harassed exegete. He must not follow the example of 'the amputative Nauck,' who struck out as a corruption every difficult line that baffled him in a classical text. It is not enough to show difficulties in the text as it stands. Any change should not only account for all the factors in the

case, but should cause the least possible disturbance to the text. It is a curious thing that (so far as I can discover) no textual suggestion for solving this difficulty has been made in any English book. Yet two (of the simplest character) have been made by foreign scholars, also a third, involving little more disturbance of the text.

Bousset (*Die Schriften des N.T.*, ed.³, 1917) and the Dutch scholar Baljon (who is quoted by Weiss) adopt the simple expedient of treating the five words as a scribe's marginal comment. The text then reads:

ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου.

What, then, does the comment mean?

(1) According to Bousset, τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ α γέγραπται = the μὴ is written above the alpha (*i.e.* the final letter of ἵνα).

(2) According to Baljon, τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ α γέγραπται is the comment of a scribe who found the μὴ (missing, by the way, in DE) added over the εἰς (written in the form of the numerical symbol α).

These conjectures agree in suggesting that the perplexing words were originally a scribe's indication of the uncertain position of the word μὴ in the text as he found it.

(3) J. Weiss, after quoting Baljon's 'very clever conjecture,' hazards a further one himself. According to this the marginal gloss reads: α γέγραπται ἵνα μὴ εἰς, *i.e.* 'the α stands in the text; read it as ἵνα not εἰς' (or possibly ἵνα ἢ εἰς, *i.e.* how is it to be resolved, ἵνα or εἰς?). This, of course, involves a slight further adjustment of the text, thus: ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ α ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθαι κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου.

This itacistic change from pres. subj. (*v.* Moulton, *Grammar*, ii. p. 200) φυσιοῦσθε to infinitive φυσιοῦσθαι has some MS. support (*8^o et al.*). That fact is not irrelevant when considering the plausibility of such a suggestion of scribal comment.

In spite of Weiss's rather pathetic remark, 'But criticism never takes such attempts seriously,' the three suggestions offered above seem to deserve attention and respect.

W. F. HOWARD.

Handsworth College,
Birmingham.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kingsgate, Aberdeen, Scotland.